Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

FREEDOM FOR VIETNAM

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, throughout the course of the struggle in Vietnam, the hopes and goals of the American people have been a lasting peace and freedom for the Vietnamese. They have been elusive goals: after much death, desolation, and destruction they still appear far off.

The recent intemperate and irresponsible statements of Premier Ky in an interview serve to increase the danger of a prolonged and enlarged conflict in Asia. Ky doesn't and should not be permitted to make American policy. His call for an immediate armed confrontation with Communist China is diametrically opposed to our policy. Ky doesn't seem to care how large this conflict grows. He lauds military victories and waxes more aggressive as American military might—and American dead—increase. Ky could be one of the biggest "coat-holders" in history.

Ky admits in this week's U.S. News & World Report that he does not represent the people of South Vietnam. He does not represent America, either, and should not be permitted to talk for us. If he can make these statements with impunity, his position against negotiations and his reckless disregard of the dangers of an expanded Vietnam war will mislead the world to believe that we have unstated aggressive aims in Vietnam.

Our aims are to bring lasting peace to that war-ravaged land and to bring freedom to the people of South Vietnam so that they can decide their own destiny; our means a prudent, measured firmness and nonaggression.

We do not need Ky to tell us who our enemies are or how we shall be committed; we shall decide that for ourselves.

Ky is a military man, leading a military regime in a country racked by military conflict. He has once again proven that he cannot rise above this; he cannot even fathom a peace conference and the political negotiations that will ultimately be necessary to bring a lasting peace to Vietnam. I ask that a statement be made immediately by the U.S. Government disavowing these imprudent remarks of Premier Ky. The world, but more important the American people, should not be mislead by default into believing that this is the policy of our Government.

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. EDMONDSON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 176, on July 25, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 176, on July 25, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTS OF 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765), to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14765, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had 4 hours and 4 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] had 5 hours remaining.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks, and over the longer period of many, many months, the riots, the looting, and the tumult and the shouting in connection therewith, have been of increasing concern and alarm by law-abiding citizens of every race and color, everywhere.

It is regrettable, indeed, that we begin debate on the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 under such conditions.

Today is not the first time that I have spoken against such unlawful action.

On January 31, 1964, in speaking for H.R. 7152, then before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, later to become the omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1964, I made the following statement:

> There is considerable pressure for civil rights legislation from certain quarters on the ground that unless legislation is enacted there will be rioting in the streets, heightened racial unrest, and the further shedding of blood. This kind of activity, in my mind, is highly improper and could do much to retard the enactment of effective civil rights legislation.
>
> No people can gain lasting liberty and equality by riot and demonstration. Legislation under such threat is basically not legislation at all. It is the rule of the mob.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. I am glad to yield to my friend from Texas for one question.

Mr. DOWDY. All right. Does the gentleman know and realize that every bill we have passed on this question has increased the riots, the demonstrations, and looting, which concern me just as they do my esteemed friend?

Mr. MCCULLOCH. I do know that riots and demonstrations have increased. There is no complete agreement as to the major causes thereof. I shall have some further comments to make about that subject later on.

In the long run, behavior of this type will lead to a total undermining of society where equality and civil rights will mean nothing.

Behavior of this type also creates the false sense of hope that once legislation is enacted, all burdens of life will dissolve.

No statutory law can completely end the discrimination which is under attack by this legislation. Intelligent work and vigilance by members of all races will be required for many years before discrimination completely disappears. To create hope of immediate and complete success can only promote conflict and result in brooding despair.

Not force or fear, then, but belief in the inherent equality of man induces me to support this legislation.

And, Mr. Chairman, I intentionally repeated that statement from more than 2 years ago because I feel just exactly that way now.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I am pleased, I am immeasurably pleased, if you please, that the President has recently spoken out against this lawless behavior which is taking place in some of our great cities and threatening to do so in many more.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that, perhaps, the effect of the great Midwest, the heartland of America, on the President on his recent trip there served a useful purpose.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin consideration of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, it is clearly apparent that it represents an historic arrival in the American quest for equal justice for all.

Here are proposals which would prohibit discrimination in the selection of State and Federal juries, and I should like to say here that the Attorney General said that he found no evidence of discrimination, and that there had been no complaints of discrimination, in this field, in either State or Federal court, in my own great State of Ohio.

Here, Mr. Chairman, are provisions which would assure equal access to public facilities and educational institutions, punish the use of force and violence against others on account of their race, color, religion or national origin and provide equal access to the

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is a useful instrument in America's effort to build a stronger economy, and a more secure foundation for world peace.

The CCC is the financial mechanism through which we share our food abundance with the hungry people of other nations.

It is a principal means through which we work to balance supply and demand, to maintain ever-normal granary reserves, to expand agricultural exports, and to provide a floor under the farmer's returns from commodity sales.

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

The food-for-freedom bill, now awaiting final congressional action is a firm expression of our national policy—and of the personal desire of most citizens to share our food abundance in the interest of world peace.

No longer is it our policy merely to share what is left over from cash markets. Rather, we shall plan our sharing in accord with the needs and best interests of the developing countries and their own resources.

But we know that we cannot provide for all the world's food needs, even if we were to bring every acre of American soil under cultivation. Thus our food aid programs must, and will, benefit those who demonstrate their willingness to help themselves by a deeper commitment to agricultural development.

SURPLUSES AND EXPORTS

Farm programs authorized by the Congress from 1961 through 1965 have helped farmers bring their production of surplus grains and other products into line with demand. They have enabled the CCC to reduce inventories that had grown too large. Storage and handling costs have been reduced $500,000 a day.

Surplus grain is no longer a threat to the livestock industry. Cash receipts from livestock products are up, and the outlook for the industry is bright.

Meanwhile, our exports of agricultural products are setting new records. They are expected to total 40 percent more this year than in 1960, due largely to tremendous increases in feed grains, wheat, and soybean exports. Farm commodity exports amount to one-fourth the value of all U.S. merchandise exported—and thus are vital in creating the foreign exchange necessary to carry on all of our business with foreign countries. The balance-of-payments problem is alleviated by our expanding agricultural exports that are aided in various ways through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

FARM INCOME

The domestic farm programs that have brought surpluses down have carried farm income up. In 1965, net farm income was fully a fifth higher than in 1960 and is expected to be up another billion dollars this year, reaching the highest level in history except for the postwar years of 1947 and 1948. Income per farm has risen 55 percent since 1960.

This is heartening progress, but we still have a long way to go toward our goal of full parity of income for the American farmer.

Though farm prices have increased 4 percent since 1960, they still are 14 percent below what they were in 1952. And this 4-percent increase in farm prices did not keep pace with the 8-percent increase in farm production costs during that same period.

And though the gap between farmer and nonfarmer income was narrowed by 18 percent in the past five and half years, farmers still earn only two-thirds per capita of what nonfarmers earn.

We cannot rest until we have achieved full parity of income for the American farmer.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

With grain surpluses nearly gone and demands increasing, farmers now look forward eagerly to the opportunity to increase production. We have already increased the national rice acreage allotment by 10 percent and the national wheat allotment by 15 percent. We have twice increased the milk support price in recent months to encourage dairy farmers to remain on the land, to increase production, and thus to assure consumers a continued, adequate supply of dairy products. We are carefully watching farm commodity supply-demand situations, and we will use our program authorities to encourage increased production whenever this appears desirable.

The flexibility of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, and of the Commodity Credit Corporation, enables us to encourage increased or decreased production, as national needs and market conditions require.

The legislation now available, together with that nearing enactment, will help us continue our progress toward parity of income. That goal is no longer a long-range hope. It is within our reach—hopefully within this decade. It can be achieved not merely by the large and highly capitalized producers, but by all efficient family-type farmers regardless of race or geography.

Like all policy objectives of a truly great society, parity of income is a classless objective, for it will serve the best interests of every citizen.

We shall use such institutions as the Commodity Credit Corporation to work for parity of income. We shall strive to keep them dynamic and viable and ready, always, to meet our future needs.

It is a pleasure to transmit to you the Commodity Credit Corporation's report for 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 26, 1966.*

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 461)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 226 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I herewith transmit a copy of a trade agreement concluded on April 5, 1966, with the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, together with a statement of the reasons for entering into the agreement.

The agreement reestablishes in terms of the revised Tariff Schedules of the United States (TSUS) that entered into force in 1963 the U.S. concessions negotiated by the two governments in previous years under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It also grants new U.S. concessions, under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, in order to offset the net impairment, incidental to bringing the TSUS into force, in the value of those old concessions. The first reductions in tariffs resulting from the compensatory concessions in the present agreement took effect on May 1, 1966; the subsequent stages of these reductions will take place annually through May 1, 1970.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 26, 1966.*

TED WILLIAMS

(Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 25, 1966, two fine Americans, Ted Williams and Casey Stengel, were installed in the Baseball Hall of Fame. By their unprecedented careers, they had long honored the sport which now honors them.

It is with special pleasure that I call to the attention of the House and to the American public the particular career of Ted Williams, immortalized yesterday at Cooperstown, N.Y.

One of the greatest and most dedicated hitters of all time, Ted's lifetime batting average was .344. He won 6 batting championships, hit 521 home runs, and was a member of 18 all-star teams. And, of course, any schoolboy knows that Ted was the last player ever to hit over .400 for a season.

But Ted Williams is a credit not only to baseball, but also to Boston, where his major league career began and ended, and to the Nation which he had twice served in the Marine Corps. His more than distinguished military record in World War II and the Korean conflict, and his participation in such charitable work as the Jimmy Fund in Boston, are to be honored as much as his place in baseball history.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, for the baseball fans of Boston and New England, who knew him best, and for everyone who ever loved the game of baseball, I ask the House now to join in honoring one of the game's greatest representatives.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

The peacetime story of Boeing is the story of its leadership in the development of the airplane as an instrument of human communication; as a reshaper of the planet; as a modifier of the relations of human beings to each other; as a destroyer of strangeness and the fears and the prejudices which have always fed on strangeness; as the one real hope of our common brotherhood, our common fate.

The post-war story begins, as great dramas often do, with disaster or the threat of disaster. It ends with triumph. And it discovers on the way, if I may say so in his very modest presence, as authentic a hero as American industry has ever produced.

The near disaster was the post-war deflation of the aircraft industry. The triumph was the technological and industrial revolution which replaced the piston plane with the jet. And the hero was a one-time teenage cherry hawker of Lolo, Montana, named William M. Allen. William M. Allen on September 1, 1945, because President of Boeing by the improbable route of the Harvard Law School. He succeeded Phil Johnson and Clair Egvedt, both able administrators, who had directed Boeing for many years. Clair Egvedt, I am glad to say, is also here with us tonight. I would ask that he stand up and be recognized.

Bill Allen could hardly have chosen a more inauspicious date to take over. The war had just ended. An important contract for B–29s had just been cancelled. A plant in Wichita had shut down. A sweeping cutback had followed here in Seattle itself.

Within sixty days, a billion and a half in contracts had been cancelled. Thirty-eight thousand workers had been laid off. Boeing's assets were down from a hundred million to thirty-three million.

Bill Allen told his wife the roof had fallen in. He was wrong. It hadn't—yet. On January 1, 1946, there was a strike of fourteen thousand workers. The work stoppage continued a hundred and fifty-four days. In addition, fifty-six Stratocruisers, on order by Pan Am and other airlines, were proving costly to produce. Instead of recovering momentum, Boeing lost fifteen million dollars on the transaction.

At this low point, Bill Allen and the Boeing Company showed their quality—which is to say, their courage. In 1949, after the three worst years in its history, Boeing suggested to the industry that the time had come for a major revolution in the manufacture of planes—a switch from piston-driven craft to jets which would eventually mean the rebuilding of the airfleets of the world. When the industry demurred—reluctant to get in deeper when the water was already cold—Boeing went ahead itself. In 1952, without an order in hand, it announced that it was investing sixteen millions of its own funds to build the prototype of "an entirely new, jet-powered transport." The prototype was to be derived from the tankers that Boeing was building for the U.S. Air Force.

The announcement was followed by action. On July 15, 1954, exactly twelve years ago, the prototype was flown. It was the forerunner of the world-famous 707.

If I were asked to name some of the events which have most dramatically changed the shape of things in our world during my lifetime, I should put that flight very near the top of the list. It promised a new dimension of speed, a new standard of reliability in the business of moving people and things from one point on the earth's surface to another. For millions of people, the 707 would shrink the globe by 40 per cent. Today, our world is a neighborhood. Today, government leaders, businessmen, teachers and scientists the world over meet face to face. They know each other.

But let us not forget that 70 per cent of Americans have yet to fly. Let us not forget that 98 per cent of the people of this world have yet to fly. Great as was the contribution of the 707, the contribution of the 747, the great Boeing superjet, will be even greater.

The 747 will carry 490 passengers plus 16½ tons of baggage, mail and freight. In all-cargo configuration it will carry more than twice the cargo of today's big transports. Its cargo will be carried in automated, nose-loaded highway-standard containers. Its great Pratt and Whitney engines will have twice the thrust of any in airline service today. Its gross weight will be more than twice today's big 707s. It will operate at 45,000 feet above lower airlanes used by all jet transports now in service. It will provide faster service on world trade routes. Lower operating costs will reduce air fares and cargo rates.

Construction of the 747s will provide employment for 55,000 people over a dozen forward years—20,000 here in Seattle; 10,000 at United Aircraft in Hartford; 25,000 more by subcontractors in 43 other states. By December, 1972, the sale abroad of 747s should contribute one billion seven hundred million dollars to the U. S. balance of payments. By December 1975, the contribution will, in my opinion, reach three billion, four hundred million dollars.

The 747 is a bold and gigantic venture in the best tradition of American industry. Competitive American private enterprise in our world has always produced the best products and the best services. Private credit and private risk-taking on a scale as yet unmatched in industry have made the 747 possible. For 20 years the 747 will mean fast, low-cost mass transportation on a scale never before available for the traveling and shipping public at home and abroad.

Far more important than its effect on fares and rates, however, will be its effect on human society and human history. The new era of mass travel between nations may well prove more significant to human destiny than the atom bomb. There can be no atom bomb potentially more powerful than the air tourist, charged with curiosity, enthusiasm and good will—who can roam the four corners of the world, meeting in friendship and understanding the people of other nations and races. The tourist plane, the bomber, and now the missile, have been racing each other to a fateful finish. In my opinion, the huge 747 can help win this race with catastrophe. The 747 will be a great new weapon for peace.

Tonight, however, we are saluting the Boeing of today as well as the Boeing of tomorrow. In honoring the company, we are paying tribute not only to its great leaders, but also to its able executives, scientists, engineers, mechanics, administartors and skilled men and women who, over the years, have created the Boeing of today.

The Boeing of today has produced the world-girdling jet fleet that carries half the air travel of the whole Free World. It is the largest government contractor in the nation. In the best tradition of American private enterprise, it has become the largest aerospace company in all the world. We salute the Boeing Company for its physical accomplishments and its contributions to the nation. But we also salute, on behalf of the entire aviation industry, an adventurous and imaginative Corporation—which has written its own saga—created its own legend—in a day in which these great assertions of the human spirit are as rare as they are greatly needed.

VIETNAM—STATEMENT BY GENERAL KY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will shortly return to the Chamber and make some comments about a column which appeared in the Washington Post this morning by Walter Lippmann under the subject of "An Old Slogan."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will at that time ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the RECORD.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] a few moments ago obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the leading editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled "New Opportunity in Vietnam."

I find myself in complete accord with this column and this editorial.

This morning's papers carry an account of an article consisting of an interview with Premier Ky of South Vietnam which appears in this week's issue of U.S. News & World Report.

I wish to comment briefly on the interrelationship between the Lippmann column, the New York Times editorial, and the interview of General Ky.

It is well known that General Ky stated publicly for a well-known British newspaper not too long ago that Adolf Hitler was his hero.

This was well before the famous Honolulu conference at which General Ky was embraced as a noble ally of the United States. General Ky now favors the American people with the suggestion that an armed confrontation with Communist China would be desirable at the present time. He concludes that Communist China is the real enemy in southeast Asia and thinks it is better to face them right now than in 5 or 10 years. Some of us will remember that there were certain Americans who felt the same way about the Soviet Union shortly after World War II. It was thought, after they got the bomb, long after we did, that we should go in and in the phrase of the day, "Clobber them before they clobber us."

Fortunately, that counsel did not prevail. It occurs to me that General Ky is a daily source of embarrassment to the administration. He states that his government is not a dictatorship, but I doubt whether we could find a reputable newspaperman in Vietnam, in Saigon, or anywhere else there, who would agree with that statement. The fact is, we are supporting a tight little dictatorship—a junta—which in terms of its ideology is no more democratic than the Vietcong against whom it is contending.

It is true that we have been promised elections in South Vietnam in September, but it will, indeed, be interesting to see whether those elections are going to be like free American elections, whether they are going to be like the Hitler elections which used to be conducted in Nazi Germany or, indeed, whether they will be like the Russian elections with which we have become familiar, where one either votes "right," with the government, or he is in serious trouble and possibly in physical danger.

I am extremely skeptical about General Ky's devotion to the cause of democracy. I think he is a great liability to the efforts of the administration to per-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

suade the peoples of the world that we are, indeed, fighting on the side of freedom and against dictatorship.

I thoroughly concur with the statements published in the New York Times editorial, to which I referred earlier, that President Ho Chi Minh's statement that there is no trial in view for American military prisoners of war in North Vietnam is a victory for the moral influence of world opinion. It does, I believe, offer hope that commonsense and common humanity may eventually prevail against the ever greater barbarism on both sides of the war in Vietnam.

I would hope that this interview by General Ky will not again dim the hopes for a fair negotiated peace. I would hope that reason can prevail on the broad issues of the war itself before it is too late.

There is no doubt about the fact that the war is not going to be settled by military means. It is a political struggle which can be resolved only by political means. We will receive little help in settling the struggle by political means from General Ky and the other members of his junta.

I would suggest, in accord with the views expressed by my friend, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., that we take the following steps:

First, stop the Americanization of the war by halting the American military buildup in South Vietnam. A quarter of a million American fighting troops is plenty—if not too many.

Second, install a civilian government in Saigon. Get rid of the junta. At least, give some semblance of a free democratic regime in that war torn country.

Third, we need to build an atmosphere conducive to negotiations by tapering off the bombing of North Vietnam, which I categorically assert has been a catastrophic failure.

As widely predicted, all it has done has been to stiffen the will of the North Vietnamese people, without destroying any military installations essential to the continued conduct of the war.

It has embittered both sides.

This morning, I had the opportunity to talk to a young lieutenant in the Naval Reserve, a brilliant and outstanding young naval airman who has just returned from conducting missions in Vietnam. There is no doubt about the fact that the defenses of North Vietnam against our air attacks are increasing every day. American casualties are increasing as the number of strikes increase. The tragic deaths of these young Americans, in my opinion, cannot be justified on any ground whatsoever. What we should do is build an atmosphere conducive to negotiations, and not continue, with the help of General Ky, to build an atmosphere which feeds on escalation and insists on total military victory even at the cost of destroying the country we are presumably attempting to preserve.

Finally, the best hope is still to persuade the reluctant Russians to join with the British in reconvening the Geneva Conference so that we can, around the conference table, with all interested parties, including a representative of the National Liberation Front try to come up with a formula for the neutralization and economic development of southeast Asia as a whole.

In this connection, and I am sure that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will have more to say on this subject, the article written by Walter Lippmann which the Senator from Oregon will shortly offer for the RECORD, is as good an exposition of how tired and obsolete our policy in Vietnam has become as I have ever seen.

I do not know what the administration reads these days, but I hope they read Mr. Lippmann, Mr. Reston, and the editorials in the great newspapers of the country. I would also hope that we could get away from the tired reiteration of a philosophy which, as I said a minute ago, is obsolete and unworkable, and turn our minds toward peace rather than war, before it is too late.

U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are two items on which I wish to comment briefly. I had not intended to comment on the first item until I listened to the brilliant and eloquent and unanswerable speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The Senator from Pennsylvania and I may have some degrees of difference, as the RECORD will show, in regard to the war in Vietnam. But we have a common objective—that is, to seek an honorable peace at the earliest possible date which will bring to an end this completely inexcusable and unjustifiable killing of American boys in South Vietnam.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to the Walter Lippmann article which was published in this morning's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OLD SLOGAN

(By Walter Lippmann)

Campaigning in the Middle West the President has used as one of his main theses the cry that the war in Vietnam is a war to end wars like the one in Vietnam. "If guerrilla warfare succeeds in Asia," he said, "it can also succeed in Africa and Latin America as well." This is precisely what we all said during the First World War. That was a "war to end war." To hear that old slogan brought out again is, to say the least, creepy. For not only did the First World War not end war, as a matter of fact it sowed the ground for the Second World War.

Presumably the President means what he is saying. But it is hard to think that anyone can believe that the outcome in Vietnam will determine whether there are guerrilla wars "in Africa and Latin America," or even in other parts of Asia. Are we really supposed to believe that the future of guerrilla warfare, that is to say of rebellion, will be determined by what happens in Vietnam?

What is the connection between the guerrilla wars waged in Ireland, Palestine, Armenia, Macedonia, Croatia, Crete, Algeria, the Congo? Were not these uprisings separate events? How can anyone deceive himself with the notion that uprisings all over the globe have some kind of underground common instigator and that they can be suppressed and discouraged by what happens in one small corner of the world?

Fifty years ago when the cry of "a war to end war" was first heard, it was used to inspire people who, themselves remote from the fighting, needed a motive to keep on with the battle. The slogan was invented by an Englishman to arouse the insular British and the isolationist Americans who, not being under fire, saw no clear vital interests which they were defending.

Mr. Johnson has dusted off the old war slogan because it is not easy to prove to the American people that they are fighting for a vital interest of the United States. In the First World War the United States did have a vital interest, which was to prevent the conquest of Great Britain and France and to keep open the Atlantic connection with Europe. This was a difficult thing to explain in the excitement of a war, and in lieu of a true explanation of the issues of the war we fell back upon the slogan of a war to end war.

In Asia the United States does indeed have a vital interest in preventing the conquest of the Asian mainland and of the islands and archipelagoes of the western Pacific. But there is no convincing reason for thinking that the war in Vietnam as it has now developed, is vital to the American interests in the world. The American position has always been that our interest in Asia must be defended and promoted without America becoming involved in such a land war as is now raging in Vietnam.

President Johnson sustained his argument about a war to end guerrilla war with loud protestations about the firmness of our intentions to persevere and to defeat guerrilla warfare. Is he sure that what people see happening in Vietnam convinces them of this? Does the deeper and deeper involvement in Vietnam indicate that we would put equal effort into another antiguerrilla war on some other continent? Or does the Vietnamese affair indicate that we would not be able to fight two or three such wars at the same time?

This is another reason for wanting to believe that this one disagreeable war, this one ever-expanding war, is the last and only war that will have to be fought. But to want to believe this does not make it believable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this article is, I think, another one of Mr. Lippmann's penetrating analyses of American foreign policy in Vietnam. As he has pointed out time and time again in his articles—in fact, he has written not so many but almost as many articles as I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on this subject—but in his penetrating article I think that he has pierced the administration's balloon by way of its continued fallacious rationalizations for carrying on the war.

He says, in the column:

Campaigning in the Middle West the President has used as one of his main theses the cry that the war in Vietnam is a war to end wars like the one in Vietnam. "If guerrilla warfare succeeds in Asia," he said, "it can also succeed in Africa and Latin America as well." This is precisely what we all said during the First World War. That was "a war to end war." To hear that old slogan brought out again is, to say the least, creepy. For not only did the First World War not end war, as a matter of fact it sowed the ground for the Second World War.

Later in the column he says:

In Asia the United States does indeed have a vital interest in preventing the conquest of the Asian mainland and of the islands and archipelagoes of the western Pacific. But there is no convincing reason for thinking that the war in Vietnam as it has now devel-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

oped, is vital to the American interests in the world. The American position has always been that our interest in Asia must be defended and promoted without America becoming involved in such a land war as is now raging in Vietnam.

Not only is a land war raging in Vietnam at the present time, but my great fear—in fact, my belief—is that every sign points to an increasing escalation in Asia that will involve, not 300,000 troops, but start to involve 3 million and more American troops in a land war in Asia.

I want to say to my President again tonight, if you continue to lead this Nation down the road to a continually escalating war, you are going to have to assume the responsibility in history for sending American troops to Asia by the millions.

The moment that war involves a land war with China, we are not going to fight it with air power. I do not think the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] could be more right in his conclusion that our bombing of Vietnam has been a failure. The indications are, from information we gather from North Vietnam and from representatives of neutral countries who have access to North Vietnam, it has intensified the determination of the North Vietnamese to fight to the last person.

So would we if we were put in the same position they are.

If we want to give the benefit of doubt to the President that the shocking course of escalation he is approving will force a surrender, it will not produce peace.

Another article which appeared in today's paper, but which I do not have at my fingertips, states that it would result in having for decades to come, a guerrilla war.

Mr. President, this war cannot be won with military might. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said, the solutions over there are not military solutions, but political solutions. Therefore, we had better give some heed to what the Senator from Pennsylvania outlined tonight in the steps we should take in an attempt to bring the war to an end, for as Lippmann points out:

> Asia must be defended and promoted without America becoming involved in such a land war as is now raging in Vietnam.

We had better give much thought to the interview in U.S. News & World Report referred to by the Senator from Pennsylvania involving General Ky. I quite agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania's appraisal of General Ky. It is a very sad thing that we are supporting that little tyrant and that American boys are dying to keep him in power.

The superpatriots in this country are taking to flag waving and the following of slogans rather than the following of facts. We had better take a look in retrospect. It was not so long ago that I warned on the floor of the Senate against following the advice of the little tyrant as he advocated the bombing of North Vietnam.

Oh, there was much protest in this country from administration spokesmen against the bombing of North Vietnam. But that was the trial balloon; that was the beginning of the propaganda; that was the beginning of the agitation in this country to lead us into the bombing of North Vietnam. Not long thereafter, we began the bombing of North Vietnam, and we have been continuing to bomb and bomb. Now we are bombing within 3 miles of the heart of the city of Hanoi, and the administration continues to tell us we are not killing civilians. That is not the report we get from foreign sources. Of course, we ought to take judicial notice that it is not possible to bomb within 3 miles of the heart of Hanoi and not be killing civilians.

This is dangerous business. The story that the President told in his trip through Kentucky and Indiana over the last weekend was quite different from the promises he made to the American people in 1964. When he was seeking reelection, he was seeking it on the basis of no such war propaganda as he advocated in his speeches in Kentucky and Indiana during the last weekend. To the contrary, he was telling the American people that the war was an Asian war for Asian boys to fight, not for American boys to fight.

Millions of Americans of the Republican Party voted for him as they rejected their own party's candidate, because they were led to believe that Lyndon B. Johnson, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, was promising them that he would not follow a foreign policy that would result in American boys fighting a war in Asia that Asian boys should fight.

I am never happy, and I shall never be happy, disagreeing with the policy of by Government in the field of foreign affairs; but I shall continue to disagree with it so long as the policy is the present policy, for that policy is unjustified and immoral. It is not possible to reconcile it on the basis of our international commitments and of our constitutional obligations.

So I quite agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that the war should be stopped; and we can stop it. That is why I say that the President ought to recognize what his military advisers recognized, and what his military advisers on occasion have briefed us—and it is public knowledge: that China cannot be defeated by bombing, nuclear or conventional. If we continue to let the little tyrant Ky egg us on into more and more military operations in North Vietnam and the sending of an American army into North Vietnam, it will not be long before that army will be involved with Chinese soldiers on the other side, because it is not possible to get that close to the China border without the Chinese recognizing that they will have to respond.

In fact, the reports appearing in the papers in the last 3 days—again from correspondents over there representing foreign newspapers—tell us that there is increasing indication that Red China recognizes that it is only a matter of time before she will have to respond to America's outlawry in Asia.

If we get ourselves involved in a land war with China, the sacrifices that we shall have to make of these precious American men whom we are sending over into a war—not a one of whom should have been sent in the first place—will discredit, in history, any President who is responsible for it.

It is not too late for us to return to moral values. It is not too late for this great religious people to insist that their government practice our religious principles in the field of foreign policy, too. And we cannot square this war, in my judgment, with the tenets of our religions.

Well, Mr. President, what should the President do? I repeat, he should announce to the world that we are stopping our bombing. He should announce to the world that we intend to hold those positions that we can hold and completely defend, and prevent the advance of the enemy, and thereby also stop advancing our own boys into an escalated engagement or series of engagements. Because, as we send them out into these battlefields, as we sit in our living-rooms—as I did last night—and observe some of the television pictures of this war being fought, with its killing, on the television screen, we must ask ourselves, "By what right does our President send those boys to their death?"

I say he has no justifiable right. He ought to adopt the military strategy of the leader who led our forces in Korea, General Ridgway. He, in my judgment, is the man whose advice should be followed. He has made perfectly clear his opposition to the escalating of this war.

The President ought to follow the advice of General Gavin, who, when he was in uniform—and he has only lately retired—was one of the two or three top military strategists of our entire Military Establishment.

What do these leaders tell us, and the other military authorities who join them? "You ought to stop the escalating. You ought to mark out those lines of defense that we know we can hold and the enemy cannot penetrate."

That places upon the President the responsibility for taking the next step, and that is to notify the nations of the world who claim they want peace to come on in and assume their obligations under their international commitments, to enforce a peace. That group of nations includes Great Britain, whose Prime Minister is coming over here. He gives lipservice to America's policy, and tells the people of the United States he is all for our position in South Vietnam.

But no British boy is dying in South Vietnam. No British boy is being sent to battle in South Vietnam by the British Prime Minister. I wish to say, he makes no favorable impression on me, with his lipservice of supporting America's war in South Vietnam, while he himself is not willing to back up his words with military support. Why, Mr. President? Obviously because the British people recognize that they should not be involved in this war.

Mr. President, the British Prime Minister and the heads of the major countries of the world, including Russia, have a clear obligation, under the United Nations Charter, to enforce a peace in southeast Asia. Therefore, the Presi-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

dent ought to adopt what is known as the enclave approach for the time being, and agree to support a cease-fire whenever these other nations are willing to declare it, backed up by their pledge that they will help enforce it.

Unless we do that, Mr. President, there will be no peace in Asia. There may be a surrender of a kind, but no peace. And this country will be bled white from the standpoint of the blood of the men who will be sacrificed, and bled white economically, as we spend the billions of dollars that it will take from the people of this country to maintain the police force that we will have to maintain in Asia after our great military power does all the devastating that can be done with nuclear and conventional bombing.

But that, as this administration's military spokesman knows, will not win a peace in Asia.

Yes, there is disunity in America, and the man more responsible for it than anyone else in the Nation is the President of the United States. Because it is the President's foreign policy that has created this disunity, and this disunity will not be made to vanish, Mr. President, by any such set of speeches as the President made in Kentucky and in Indiana over the weekend.

I would like to see unity. But, Mr. President, there are too many who recognize that a President has no justifiable right to send these boys to their slaughter without a declaration of war, under the Constitution of the United States. And why does he not call for it? He does not dare. He does not dare, not only because any proposal on his part for a declaration of war would not only deepen the disunity in the United States until a declaration is passed—if it is passed—but because it would alienate more and more of the countries in the world that we would like to have as our allies.

And so, Mr. President, I think the President has a great obligation, in the absence of a declaration of war, to proceed to announce to the world that we are going to stop the escalating.

We are not going to get out of Vietnam. I have never proposed that we get out of Vietnam. We are going to hold there in positions that we can defend in order to prevent the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese from creating a great blood bath.

Then we are going to say to the rest of the world, "You too, have a stake in peace in southeast Asia, and we are going to hold there until you have an opportunity to come in and carry out your international obligation."

I intend to continue to hold to that position until there is a declaration of war, if one comes.

On the basis of the present facts, I would vote against it, but if there is a declaration of war, it is for Congress to do and not the President. He can recommend it.

He ought to read again the war messages of great Presidents before him, and particularly the war message of Woodrow Wilson at the time of World War I, when he said to the joint session of Congress that he was without constitutional authority to make war without congressional declaration of war.

Mr. President, I think my President owes it to the American people to either deescalate this war or to lay the issues squarely before the people and Congress with a proposed declaration of war, and let the people be the judge.

Although I disagree with my President in the field of foreign policy, I agree with him on so many matters in other fields, and particularly in the field of domestic policy, that I think it is a shame that some way, somehow, this great man—for he is a great man—does not recognize the horrendous mistake that he is making by following the foreign policy that, in my judgment, a Secretary of State, a Secretary of Defense, and some other bad advisers have apparently sold to him.

I shall never give up hope that the facts will finally get through to him and he will change our course of action.

THE AIRLINE STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Breaking the Air Blockade," printed in the New York Times of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAKING THE AIR BLOCKADE

Congressional action has plainly become the only realistic hope for a quick end to the paralyzing airlines strike. The Senate Labor Committee will hear from members of President Johnson's Cabinet today precisely how seriously the strike's impact has been. We hope its hearing will be followed by swift passage of legislation to get the planes back into the air and thus restore normalcy to a key segment of the nation's transportation lifeline.

We have already expressed our belief that Congress should do what it did in the 1963 rail strike threat and impose compulsory arbitration. But it is plain that, with Congressional elections only a little over three months off, the mood on Capitol Hill is not strong for legislation that would thus affront organized labor. Under these circumstances the best stop gap measure would be the revised bill proposed by Senator MORSE for a new cooling-off period of 180 days. That would get everybody back on the job while a new Presidential board tried to end the wage dispute. If it got nowhere after 150 days, it would make recommendations to the President and he, in turn, would tell Congress what he thought it ought to do to assure a final settlement.

This is certainly the long way around in a controversy that has already been before a Presidential emergency board, headed by Senator MORSE—a board whose recommendations the President has endorsed without reservation. The unhappy history of past disputes makes it probable that much of the Government's focus in the new truce period will be on purchasing peace through appeasement of the union by management, even though the terms the union is now rejecting exceed the Administration's anti-inflation guideposts.

It is obvious that no adequate solution to problems of this sort will be found until the White House and Congress are willing to discard politics and grapple with the intricate problems involved in any long-range recasting of the national emergency provisions of the present Taft-Hartley and Railway Labor Acts. At least the 180-day truce will postpone a fresh showdown until after the elections. Perhaps then there will be enough resolution in Washington to consider answers, not expedients.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the first sentence reads:

Congressional action has plainly become the only realistic hope for a quick end to the paralyzing airline strike.

Mr. President, I was very much interested in an item that came over the ticker a little while ago. It reads:

AFL-CIO President George Meany urged the Senate to drop plans to intervene.

"Sen. MORSE's bill already has served as a deterrent to free collective bargaining," Meany said in a statement.

"Every minute Congress spends on this ill-advised proposal keeps the parties from honest negotiations, the only sound method for resolving this dispute," Meany said, adding:

"No danger to the Nation's health and welfare and no threat to the national defense has been demonstrated. The air traveling public has, of course, been inconvenienced, but inconvenience is a small price to pay for freedom."

And he claims to be a labor leader. Mr. President, I served with George Meany on the War Labor Board during World War II. Apparently he has suffered some lapses of memory.

George Meany apparently forgets the times that he sat on the War Labor Board and voted for seizure of American plants and industry in order to protect the public interest.

The bill that I first introduced last Friday was very similar to the policies that we followed in World War II. Wherever it was demonstrated on the facts that the paramount public interest in time of war was going to be sacrificed because of the adamancy either of a union or of an employer, the War Labor Board decided sometimes with labor, and sometimes with management to take over the plant.

The majority of the Board time and time again decided that in order to protect the paramount public interest, the American flag had to be run up over that plant, and that all of them would have to work for that flag. However, the workers would get fair wages and the employers would receive a guarantee that they would get the benefits that would come from the business under Government management. Not a managerial officer was moved from behind a manager's desk.

The so-called seizure was by token. The proposal I offered last Friday was of the same import. There would have been a receivership instead of a seizure under my resolution. Management would have stayed behind the desk. In the War Labor Board days, the so-called income from the plant would go into the Treasury of the United States, and the owners of the plant were guaranteed compensation for the operation of the plant.

Mr. President, the management made more money under that arrangement because of the benefits they received than they would have made under their own management.

I understand why there was concern about my bill of last Friday on the part of managerial forces in the country, in that they thought it might be a bad

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

THE TROUBLED TIMES IN WHICH WE LIVE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, yesterday the Dow-Jones industrial average of the New York Stock Exchange fell 16.32 points, or 1.88 percent, to a new 1966 low of 852.83. This was the worst market setback since November 22, 1963, the day President Kennedy was assassinated.

What caused this sharp loss of millions of dollars in the paper value of the shares traded on the exchange? Was it news of a national disaster? Did the foreign or domestic policies of the United States take a drastic change for the worse? No; it was none of these. It was simply the stock market and the people who deal in the stock market expressing their uncertainty of what the future holds for our country.

This uncertainty in the world's greatest marketplace is both domestic and international in scope.

Internationally, our close friends the British have embarked upon a program of austerity to save the value of the pound. The Labor government of Prime Minister Wilson has once again nationalized the British steel industry against strong opposition from the Conservatives.

In the field of international negotiations, the Kennedy round negotiations in Geneva remain at a standstill while the members of the EEC concentrate on mending the fences of the Common Market. Efforts to bring about international monetary reform have ground to a halt while the members of the Group of 10 bicker among themselves. In the meantime, the world's supply of monetary reserves continues to dwindle while we rapidly approach an international monetary crisis.

Here at home, we face uncertainty in every aspect of our economic, political, and social life.

What are we going to do about Vietnam? What are we going to do about inflation? Will we have higher taxes? These are all questions we ask ourselves every day.

Added to this are the riots in Chicago, New York, and Cleveland. The airline strike. The growing weak spots in our economy in the sectors dealing with home construction and automobile production. The tight money and high interest rate situation. And the slowdown in the growth rate of the economy.

All of these things add to our uncertainty, and nowhere are they more graphically portrayed than in the traditional barometer of national opinion, the stock market.

It is time we brought an end to all of this uncertainty. It is time we began to act positively instead of negatively in our foreign and domestic affairs.

This administration could easily do away with all of the uncertainty. Tell the American people the truth about Vietnam. Tell them how long it expects the war will last and how much it estimates it will cost.

Tell the American people the truth about the state of the economy. Tell them if it is believed that higher taxes are necessary to halt the spread of inflation.

Have the United States take the lead in the Kennedy round negotiations and in the negotiations on international monetary reform. Why should the richest industrial country in the world be dictated to by the Europeans in these meetings? We should be leaders, not followers.

We are living in troubled and uncertain times, and they will continue to become more troubled and uncertain if we continue to permit this shroud of secrecy to surround the facts.

I have strong faith in the American people. They have been through good times and bad. They love their country. To them, no sacrifice is too great for her.

They are willing to stand by her in her darkest hour, but they cannot be expected to do this until they are told the facts. Therefore, I ask that this shroud of secrecy be removed. I ask that the facts be presented. I ask that this uncertainty whch plagues our country today be removed from the minds of her citizens, and be replaced with the facts.

THE LIGHT OF HOPE SHINES THROUGH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, out of the dark hours of the past 2 weeks, while the fate of American war prisoners has hung in the balance, comes the first ray of hope from Hanoi.

The weight of world opinion calling for humanitarian treatment of all war prisoners—including the "plea for sanity" issued on July 15, in which I was joined by 18 of my Senate colleagues who have opposed the escalation of the Vietnemese war—has apparently registered in Hanoi. North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh now indicates there is no trial in view for American military prisoners.

Let us hope this decision, as the New York Times expresses it in this morning's lead editorial, may offer hope that commonsense and common humanity ultimately may prevail against the ever greater barbarism the war in Vietnam daily inflicts on both sides.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial, entitled "New Opportunity in Vietnam" may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW OPPORTUNITY IN VIETNAM

President Ho Chi Minh's statement that there is "no trial in view" for American military prisoners in North Vietnam is a victory for the moral influence of world opinion. That victory transcends the fate of the captive airmen, for it offers hope that common sense and common humanity ultimately may prevail against the ever greater barbarism the war in Vietnam daily inflicts on both sides.

The United States has yielded to the pressure of world opinion in the past by offering peace proposals and twice suspending the bombing of North Vietnam. But this is the first time that Hanoi has shown regard for the opinion of mankind. Its decision to back away from talk of "war crimes trials" follows direct pleas from Secretary General Thant, Pope Paul VI, numerous governments and opinion leaders everywhere, including eighteen liberal American Senators. The hope now must be that reason can prevail on the broader issues of the war itself.

The conflict in Vietnam is a political struggle that, in the end, can only be resolved by political means. In politics, timing is of the essence. A number of opportunities to probe the prospects for peace have been neglected in the past. It is vital that the new atmosphere and the new opportunity opened by Hanoi's response on the prisoner issue not be missed as well.

The approach favored by American moderates and long urged by The Times has just been summed up admirably by Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. One essential element is to stop the Americanization of the war by halting the American buildup in South Vietnam; a quarter of a million American troops is more than enough. The second vital element is a civilian Government in Saigon that can open contact with the insurgent forces. Third, is the need to build an atmosphere conducive to negotiations by tapering off the bombing of North Vietnam. Finally, efforts to reconvene the Geneva conference must be linked with broad diplomatic discussions with Moscow, Paris and other interested states to find a formula for the neutralization and economic development of Southeast Asia as a whole.

Most of all, what is needed is a clear indication that the American objective is not military victory but political settlement. The American ability to escalate the war needs no further demonstration. The need now is to halt the escalation and make a vigorous new effort to achieve peace.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOEING CO.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, while in my home State recently, I had the privilege of participating in the celebration of the 50th anniversary of one of this Nation's great aviation pioneers—the Boeing Co., of Seattle.

The major address on that occasion was delivered by Mr. Juan Trippe, chairman of the board of Pan American World Airways. I consider his address an inspiring lesson in American aircraft history, and a clear portrayal of the opportunity and challenge of the future for this great company and the others which will shape the destiny of air transportation.

The Boeing path to success has not been without difficulty and crisis. Almost all of it is familiar to me, for I have lived with these problems.

Mr. Trippe traced the history of Boeing from the first piano wire seaplane, delivered to the Navy as a trainer 2 years before the end of World War I, to the fabulous 747, which can well revolutionize the business of air transportation. From the tiny piano wire trainer to an aircraft that will carry 490 passengers and 16½ tons of baggage, mail, and freight, is vast progress in just half a century, but the determined faith and keen vision of Boeing Co. leadership promises that the coming 50 years will be even more significant.

The American aircraft industry, as Mr. Trippe suggested, is one of the toughest areas of competition in the Nation, and to merely survive, there must be constant steps forward toward an uncertain future. The Boeing Co. has done more than survive, and its aircraft today carry more than half the air travel of the free world. I salute this tower

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

of progress in our national industrial scene, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Trippe's historic message be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Any lawyer can tell you that a corporation has powers but no personality and above all no soul. Imagination, daring, persistence, patience, vision, the great qualities of the human spirit, are beyond its reach. And yet we are met here today to pay the tribute of our respect and admiration to a corporation which has survived and prospered for fifty years precisely because it possesses and has exercised imagination and daring, vision and persistence—plus, of course, outstanding business acumen.

I have no wish, and certainly no competence, to rewrite the text books of corporation law, but I propose, nevertheless, to dwell on this paradox a moment. For the fact is that the history of the Boeing Company, when one looks back at it with the perspective of half a century, is more like some Norse saga or Greek epic which we learned about in high school than it is like a corporate record. Of course, there were board meetings and legal opinions and tax problems and all the rest of the familiar paraphernalia from one end of the story to the other. What I find myself thinking of, however, when I try to pull it all together in my mind is the fabulous journey of Ulysses, King of Ithaca, from one impossible adventure to another—and always with a high heart, a shrewed eye, a bold spirit and the never defeated determination to get back to Ithaca somehow—even if he, like the Greek god Hermes, had to fly.

The story begins, of course, rather more modestly than Homer's poem. There were no Topless Towers of Ilium to be conquered. Instead you have the Duwamish Flats here in Seattle and a young man out of Yale with extensive lumber holdings who knows about the Lafayette Esquadrille and who would rather build planes than cut timber. This young man is named Bill Boeing. Along with such men as Donald Douglas, Glenn Martin and Frederick Rentschler, he is to found a new and vital industry.

To build his planes, he has assembled a few carpenters, a supply of spruce, some linen fabric and a number of rolls of piano wire together with propeller blades and what passed at the time for motors. He has somehow or other combined these several parts—exclusive of the carpenters—into airplanes—which actually fly and which are sold eventually as Navy trainers.

From the start, the Boeing enterprise succeeded. From the start, too, there were troubles and dangers—dangers to which the Corporation was to become accustomed as time went by. Two years after the first piano wire seaplane was delivered on the Duwamish Flats, World War I ended—as World War II was to end with similar consequences—thirty years later. The Navy's need of trainers ended with it.

The result, of course, was a conference of Bill Boeing and his associates to consider a question which arose with some persistence in those days: Was there a future in the aircraft business? And the answer, obviously—and I can say obviously because I knew Bill Boeing and because I knew well the characteristics he bred into his company—was *yes*. Or, more precisely, *yes-if*. There was a future in the aircraft business if you built a few seasleds and a little household furniture on the side.

Incidentally, as the Chairman just pointed out, Mrs. Boeing is not with us tonight. Bill Boeing's son, I am glad to say, however, is with us. I would like to ask him to rise and be recognized.

While Bill Boeing's decision was a wise one at the time, it was not one that satisfied Bill Boeing. His heart was never in seasleds or mahogany bureaus. He wanted to build planes. But if you built planes, whom would you build them for? And the question remained: was there a future in the aircraft manufacturing business? Would operating aircraft ever be a business? Bill Boeing decided that the answer was "yes."

Bill Boeing's next decision was to go into the air mail business. Of this chapter in the story I can speak with personal knowledge. I had helped organize and was managing Colonial Air Transport when it started operations in October of 1925 as the first airline contractor to the Post Office Department. Colonial carried passengers and mail between Boston and New York where we made connections with the experimental government air mail line being run by the Post Office Department between New York, Chicago and San Francisco.

I well remember being present on July 1, 1924, when the experimental overnight service from New York to Chicago started. The airplane was a frail, temperamental wartime DH-4 in whose box-like nose an old Liberty engine clattered away. It could carry only a hatful of mail and a couple of hours' gas. The lone pilot had no blind-flying instruments, no safety aids except his parachute. Ahead of him were no marked airways, no chain of airports, no radio beam to guide him. His only ground aids were bonfires to be lit by friendly farmers on mountain tops along his way. His weather service was an eye cocked aloft—and a prayer.

Air transportation in those days was not a business. It was scarcely a hope of one. Postal revenue from the few pounds of mail the airplane could carry hardly paid for the gasoline. You couldn't find a passenger revenue dollar with a telescope. And capital was even harder to uncover.

Late in 1926, the Post Office Department wisely decided also to transfer its experimental transcontinental service to private enterprise. Bill Boeing decided to bid on the larger portion of this trunkline route, between Chicago and San Francisco. His bid was far below that of his nearest competitor for he would use a new airplane—the 40A—which he would build, equipped with a new and more efficient engine, the Pratt and Whitney Wasp Radial.

Although his bid was successful, for Bill Boeing the outlook was dim when, a month ahead of target, only one of his 40As was in service.

Nevertheless, by July 1, 1927, the contract starting date, twenty-five of the new planes were ready to fly. They had actually been delivered to their appointed places along the two thousand miles of the new route.

It was a prophetic operation—and in more ways than one. Boeing's business gamble paid off over the next two years. Thirteen hundred tons of mail were carried. Six thousand passengers, more or less smothered under the mail bags, had entrusted themselves successfully to the Boeing airline.

Once Bill Boeing had satisfied himself that you could build transport planes to carry mail and people at a profit, things began to hum at Boeing. The Boeing 247, the first twin-engine transport, followed the 40A in 1933—carrying 10 passengers, a crew of two and—oh, great and unsung date in American history, a stewardess as well. The whole thirteen of them roared across the continent in a mere twenty hours with only seven stops!

We, in Pan American, were engaged in those years in charting and testing the great overseas routes which soon made transpacific and transatlantic service possible. We remember with gratitude today the early Sikorskis, the S-38, and S-40 and S-42, the Martin China Clippers and the great Boeing Yankee Clippers which pioneered the trade routes across the Atlantic and Pacific.

It was Boeing that built the first pressurized transport, the four-engined 307. Later came the Douglas DC4 and the Lockheed Constellation. And we all remember the great Boeing 377s, the glamorous double-decked Stratocruisers that for many years led the way over the ocean trade routes.

Still later came the Douglas DC6 and DC7 series and the successive models of the Lockheed Constellation. One of the reasons why the aviation industry of the United States leads the world is the vigorous competition that has always characterized the industry. Boeing, in the best American business tradition, has always had to face outstanding competitors.

But there was one development of these critical years for which Boeing, and Boeing alone, must take the credit. I refer to the plane to which this Republic owes more, perhaps, than to any other in the history of aviation: the B-17. If there is one event in the rich and fabulous history of the Boeing Corporation which illustrates better than another the Company's imagination, its daring and its fundamental know-how, it was the building of the Flying Fortress.

The story begins, simply enough, with the Corporation designing and building, at its own cost and with its own resources, a prototype later identified as the B-17, a four-engined, heavily armed bomber with a range of three thousand miles and a top speed of two hundred and thirty-six miles an hour.

Now this, my friends, was the year 1934, with the Second World War five years off. A romantic historian with the historian's professional advantage of looking backward, might be excused for endowing the Boeing Company with second sight. Why? Because the B-17 played a larger part in winning the Second World War than any other weapon.

Unfortunately for romantic historians, however, no second sight was available in the government in 1934. The War Department then rejected the four-engined bomber as too advanced, not to say visionary, leaving the Boeing Company to hold the bag and also—fortunately for the nation—the B-17 as well. But Boeing itself that year was thinking of planes—as it has always thought of them—with a free-wheeling, uninhibited imagination and the intestinal fortitude to make its dream come true.

How true it came, a few statistics will suggest. When Hitler exterminated himself under the bunker in Berlin and the war in Europe ended, thirteen thousand B-17s had been built. The B-17s had dropped six hundred and forty thousand tons of bombs on Nazi installations and industries. Moreover, B-17s had shot down as many enemy aircraft over Europe as all other American planes combined. Yes, many of us here tonight can vividly recall the American bomber bases along the East Coast of Britain. We who saw them will never forget the spectacle of the departing armadas or the sight of the Flying Fortresses returning at dusk—those that did return.

The B-17, tried and tested in the war, also sired the great B-29 that became the basis for American strategy in the Pacific.

The parade of big Boeing bombers—weapons systems as we call them these days—continued on after the war with the six-engined Strato-jet, the B-47, and today the tremendous B-52, capable of carrying heavier and more effective weapons farther than any other airplane now in existence or in prospect.

As long as men remember the Second World War and the world which followed it—and men, I suspect, will remember them for a long time—Boeing's fame as armorer to the Republic will be secure.

If the military story is brilliant, the peacetime story has about it the elements of greatness, of true greatness. If the first has inventiveness, the second has vision.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Therefore be it resolved that the second (Indian Head) Division Association, San Antonio Branch, in regular meeting held on this the 22d day of May A.D. 1966, does respectfully request the Department of the Army set aside the approximate 118 acres, aforementioned, for future expansion of the Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery, and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to the National President, Second (Indian Head) Division, Inc.; to the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH and the Honorable JOHN G. TOWER, United States Senators, Texas; and the Honorable H. B. GONZALEZ and the Honorable O. C. FISHER, United States Congressmen, Texas; respectfully soliciting their support and assistance in this matter.

ORBRA L. LONGLEY,
President, Second (Indian Head) Division, San Antonio Branch.

Attest:

RICHARD B. HARN,
Secretary, Second (Indian Head) Division, San Antonio Branch.

MRS. KENNEDY THANKS HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on her departure from Hawaii, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy wrote a stirring tribute to the news media, the Governor, and the people of my State, for their generous efforts to make her visit a happy experience.

In recognition of these efforts by so many people of Hawaii, and as a token of my deep respect for Mrs. Kennedy, I respectfully request that her letter be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 23, 1966.

DEAR SIR: As I leave Hawaii after these beautiful weeks. I should like to thank you, the Editor of the *Honolulu Advertiser* and the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* for all that you have done to make this vacation such a perfect one for my children and for me.

I had forgotten, and my children have never known what it was like to discover a new place, unwatched and unnoticed.

It was your papers that made this possible for us, by deciding at the beginning not to follow our activities. It was completely against your interests to do this. As I understand the problems and pressures the press endures, I truly appreciate the extraordinary gesture you made.

But now I think I should not have been surprised. In this strange land everyone constantly goes out of his way to be kind to the other.

From Governor Burns, who so kindly watched over us and asked people to help make our visit private, to the driver of a vegetable truck who went out of his way to lead us several miles, when we merely asked for direction, everyone in Hawaii has been the same.

Now I know what the Aloha spirit means. I hope it is contagious—for it could change the world.

With my deep appreciation, and our deepest hopes for coming back again.

Sincerely,

JACQUELINE KENNEDY.

REPUBLICANS LOOK AT THE FUTURE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the Senate Republican Policy Committee recently issued a penetrating study of the American electorate in the mid-60's, and projected its study into the 1970's to determine the issues that must be met in order to attract a majority of the votes.

This analysis places special emphasis on the issues confronting the younger generation. It points out that the growth of the 20- to 34-year-old population in the next 20 years is over 20 million; and growth of the under-20 population in that period is over 35 million. The study declares that whichever party offers the most rational solutions to the problems facing this group may well win the "respect and long-term allegiance of this new electorate."

The State of Michigan recognizes the growing responsibility and authority of the younger generation, and is placing on the November ballot a referendum to decide whether the minimum voting age should be 18 instead of 21. For my part, I strongly favor the minimum voting age at 18.

Another problem—education—is very much in the minds of our youth. The progress of education, in large measure, depends on greater training opportunities for our teachers and for all the youth of our land.

As one of several steps in this direction, I have introduced legislation to provide a tax credit for parents sending their sons and daughters to college. I have also introduced a bill granting tax deductions to teachers continuing their education.

Mr. President, an interesting article on the Republican Policy Committee's study was printed in the Washington Post under John Chamberlain's byline. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS LOOK AT THE FUTURE

(By John Chamberlain)

The Republican Party hasn't distinguished itself recently either at the polls or as a "loyal opposition" in Congress. Nor does it seem to be making much effort to dramatize, through the activities of its National Committee, the issues that might be used to beat Democrats next November. Amid the general melancholy that this columnist feels when he contemplates Republican activities, however, it is a pleasure to report that some Republicans are doing a bit of solid thinking about the future of their party in the strange new world that will be upon us when the Vietnamese war has been finally trundled off stage.

The solid thinking turns up in a study, "Where the Votes Are," that has just been issued by the staff of Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER'S U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee. What distinguishes this study is its almost total avoidance of the cliches of usual political discourse. Instead of gabbling about the "mainstream" or "consensus," the Hickenlooper staff has tried to map the contours of the world of the Nineteen Seventies, with an eye to determining the issues that must be met in order to attract a majority of votes.

Plunging into the thick of things after some rather lugubrious observations on falling Republican registration figures, the report observes that all the old "power centers"—labor, the farm bloc, Big Business—are losing ground to the new power group of the professional and managerial middle class. This new power group is not particularly "party minded"; it tends to vote "in terms of a reaction to problems, not an allegiance to philosophies." The new power group is accustomed to both affluence and security, and it knows little about the world of the Nineteen Thirties, which still control the politics of Lyndon Johnson's generation. In a few more years the young, with no memories of the Depression or World War II, will be taking over completely. The Hickenlooper report observes that "with citizens over age thirty-five increasing by less than 18 million, while citizens under thirty-five increase fully 61 million, certain political inevitabilites become starkly obvious."

We had a well-advertised baby boom in 1945–55. It added 25 million to the population. Ten years from now, when the babies have babies in their turn, a "hospital-busting 46 million increase will begin." So politics will become that art of accommodating to crowds, crowds, crowds.

It will be a "school-centered society," preoccupied with the problem of educating new millions. It will be increasingly worried about providing the young with adequate teachers, and "in less than 10 years we'll have more teachers voting than farmers." (Exit the farm bloc, enter the educationist bloc.)

The farms of America will be businesses, many of which will not be doing actual farming.

The Hickenlooper report argues that the "small" irritants of yesterday will become the "major, nerveshattering issues of today and tomorrow." Pollution will be our biggest headache. The politician will be judged on his responses to the problem of getting sewage and industrial wastes out of Lake Erie or the Connecticut River, and smoke and grime and sulfur out of the metropolitan air. The Hickenlooper group doesn't want to see Washington becoming the "senior partner" in the politics of meeting the problems of the new world. It notes that an "eight-state Ohio River Compact Commission" is even now using its authority to compel industries in the Ohio Basin to "return to the river water as pure or purer than that withdrawn." With reference to the growth of the Negro population, the report observes that "Republicans could sponsor a wide variety of training programs, even financial assistance programs, to enable the nonwhite to learn business and commercial operations, to become managers or owners of the many, many service-type establishments needed in urban areas."

This is constructive Republicanism, something for every Republican to go to work on, whether his name be Rockefeller, or Reagan, or Romney, or just plain Joe Doakes.

PROPOSED TRIALS OF AMERICAN SOLDIERS AS WAR CRIMINALS BY NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the recent North Vietnamese threat to try captured American soldiers as war criminals is fraught with great peril, for if such trials were to be conducted, and if our airmen were to be executed, the United States would have no other choice but to take devastating retaliatory action. In my opinion, an infuriated American public would demand such retaliation.

In view of the reaction to his threat, not only in America but throughout most of the world as well, Ho Chi Minh appears to be backing down some. He is wise to do so.

Moreover, the Hanoi government would be wise also to call a halt to the brutal murder of wounded American fighting men such as that reported in eyewitness accounts yesterday. We cannot and will not tolerate such atrocities; and, if they are repeated, the wrath of the American people is certain to be felt in North Vietnam as never before, and as it should be.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Mr. President, the Macon, Ga., Telegraph of July 20 and the Augusta, Ga., Herald of July 19 published excellent editorials concerning the Communist threat to try captured U.S. servicemen. I invite the attention of the Senate to them and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, July 20, 1966]

EXECUTION OF PRISONERS WOULD INVITE REPRISAL

The ground rules of war require prisoners to be protected against violence, intimidation, insult, and public curiosity. The North Vietnamese already have violated the rules by marching captured American airmen through the streets of Hanoi under armed escort.

A real rupture of the rules will occur if, as suggested in wire dispatches from other Communist capitals, the airmen are put on trial as "war criminals."

The 1949 Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War which forbids such treatment, "to all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict," North Viet Nam signed the accord in 1957.

What is atrocity and what is playing the game by the rules in the agonizing illogic of modern war is a dilemma usually reserved for civilians. At least one GI prisoner of war has been murdered by the Viet Cong in reprisal for the execution in Saigon of VC terrorists. On the other hand, there have been reports published of atrocities by the South Vietnamese. What happens in the heat of battle is perhaps understandable, if not excusable.

Should Hanoi try and execute the captured American pilots, this nation's anger is certain to be great. Such action by the North Vietnamese would invite retaliation in one form or another.

James Reston of the New York Times has written: "Nobody who knows anything about Lyndon Johnson can have much doubt about the severity of his reaction if the fliers he sent into North Viet Nam are executed against the standards of international law for carrying out his orders."

The United States never ratified the 1925 Geneva Convention against chemical-biological warfare. But in 1948 President Roosevelt pledged that the U.S. would not use gas-germ weapons except in retaliation.

Executing or even cruelly punishing or humiliating our airmen is bound to arouse the American public and in the long run hurt the North Vietnamese. We hope Hanoi has the good sense to realize that.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald, July 19, 1966]

WARNINGS TO HANOI

It is very difficult to imagine any North Vietnamese action which would redound more to their own disadvantage than the threatened war criminal trial by Hanoi of captured members of the U.S. armed forces.

On every hand there is reflected the intense outrage and purpose to all-out retaliation which the projected "trials" seems uniformly to arouse. From President to pundit to public the sentiment appears uniforms; such trials, certainly any executions resulting therefrom, would unquestionably loose unrestrained fury upon the perpetrators.

The UN's U Thant and Britain's Harold Wilson, both of whom look with disfavor upon U.S. activity in Viet Nam, have urged the captors of the Americans to abandon any thought of trials.

Escalation of the war would be immeasurably intensified, most likely with firm public support and demand. No one as attuned to public sentiment as President Johnson usually is can be unaware that the Administration has lagged behind apparent public opinion in the tempo of the war. Approval of the stepped-up offensive is general.

Of course most of us, despising the war in the deepest recesses of our being, do not wish to unleash U. S. fury without restraint. Such warfare must inevitably destroy multitudes of bystanding Vietnamese civilians. Like as not, as the might of our war machine rolled over the small nation, destroying and killing, the few leaders really guilty would troop off into Red China, whole of limb and skin, leaving the hapless civilians to suffer for the misdeeds of the leadership.

Let the clearest words, such as those delivered by Secretary of State Rusk yesterday, inform Hanoi of U.S. feeling and determination. No possible doubt should be permitted about the sureness of swift retaliation. The blistering destruction which would fall upon the North Vietnamese would bring no glory to the U.S., but any action short of the most extreme would be unacceptable to the American public.

There is some possibility that, despite the blustering and attempted menace in Sunday's statements by the northern president, Ho Chi Minh, Hanoi has gotten the message. For there had been speculation that the announcement would include information relating to the captive U.S. service men, and likely also to the matter of trials. No mention was made, however, of the prisoners and their fate.

THE HEROIC WORK OF FRANK MRKVA

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it is the strong and sincere desire of all of us that true patriotism shall always remain alive and vibrant in this free country of ours, and I believe we should give public recognition to outstanding examples of it when they occur.

Today, Mr. President, I ask this honorable body to join me in saying thanks to a young man who risked his life for 4½ years in silent devotion to duty and love for this country. Because of his contribution, 180 million Americans are a little bit safer in their homes today.

The name of this young man is Frank Mrkva, and he is the General Services officer in the Passport Office at the Department of State. He has been a Government employee for about 11 years and has risen from the grade of G–3 to G–11 through dedication of his time and talents to his job. Four and a half years ago he began doing double duty for single pay for his country with the knowledge only of his immediate superiors and high officials of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

A Communist diplomat from Czechoslovakia befriended Mr. Mrkva in the course of official business and began trying to get certain information and documents from him. Mr. Mrkva reported the developments to Mr. Robert Johnson, his immediate superior, the Chief Counsel and Chief Security Officer of the Passport Office. With the additional knowledge only of Mr. Johnson's administrative aid, Mrs. Constance Lumardi, and Miss Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office, the matter was reported to the FBI and Mr. Mrkva began his harrowing double life. Miss Knight and these other two people in the Passport Office are entitled to great credit also. They told no one, not even the high officials in the State Department.

Mr. Mrkva's initial meeting was with Zdenek Pisk, then Third Secretary and later Second Secretary of the Czechoslovakian Embassy. At Pisk's invitation, Mr. Mrkva attended social functions at the Embassy, to which he had been accustomed to delivering and waiting for passports in his job as visa courier in the Passport Division.

The first overt act by Pisk to enlist Mr. Mrkva into the Czecholsovakian espionage network was on November 30, 1961, when he invited Mr. Mrkva to dinner at a metropolitan restaurant and asked him numerous questions about his family, background, relatives in Czechoslovakia and State Department duties. There followed, from November 1961 to July 1966, a total of 48 meetings by Mr. Mrkva with Czechosolvakian officials—11 with Pisk and later 37 with a second agent, Jiri Opatrny, an attache of the Czechosolvakian Embassy who took over the spy operations from Pisk in May 1963.

The two Czech agents paid Mr. Mrkva a total of $3,440 which the American Government employee turned over to the FBI as the payments were made for him to perform certain functions requested by the Czechs.

Most of the meetings were held in the Maryland suburbs of Washington and on the park benches in Northwest Washington. One was held in front of a theater in Northeast Washington, one in Southeast Washington, and another in a Virginia suburban shopping center.

During the entire period of his contact with the Czech espionage agents, Mr. Mrkva acted with full knowledge and guidance of the FBI and his superiors in the Passport Office. At the beginning, he supplied such inconsequential items as a State Department telephone book to the Czech agents. Later he transmitted press releases and certain administrative reports which had been cleared by the FBI. As his relationship with the Czechoslovakian agents progressed, the Communists' interests became more specific. They wanted to obtain a blank U.S. passport of a new series. They wanted information concerning rooms and locations of high officials in the State Department dealing with Czechoslovakian affairs. Finally, they asked Mr. Mrkva to place a listening device—a "bugging" mechanism, if you please—in the office of Mr. Raymond Lisle, Director of the Office of Eastern European Affairs.

Mr. Mrkva, again with FBI clearance, provided Czech Agent Opatrny with a General Services Administration catalog of Government furniture to aid in designing the listening device so that it could be placed unobtrusively in Mr. Lisle's office. This was in December 1965.

After several more meetings, Opatrny delivered an electronic "bugging" device to Mr. Mrkva on May 29, 1966. The device could be activated and deactivated by remote control and was to be placed in the base of a bookcase in Mr. Lisle's office. Opatrny promised to pay Mr. Mrkva $1,000 for making the installation. Mr. Mrkva turned the device over to FBI agents in the State Department Building.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

to change your mind, to make different decisions in the future.

"Secondly, since almost all important policy judgments are speculative, you must avoid risking too much on the conviction that you are right."

Of course, agnoticism about the future cannot be permitted to sever the nerve of action in the present, but present action must confront the concrete situation and the specific circumstance. The curse of international affairs is the statesman who sees himself as philosopher and moralist—we have had some such in Washington—and proposes to resolve all questions according to a higher law visible only to himself and others of the *illuminati*. Let us pledge ourselves to an economy of means, renounce self-righteousness and not try to settle questions which do not need to be settled. Your countrymen and mine find it especially hard to forsake the pleasures of preaching to lesser breeds, but it still might be worth the effort for both of us. The hard fact is that with all our superiority, we cannot intelligently base decisions on a non-existent chart of the future; so we might as well stick to what we know.

I read the other day a sagacious letter written 70 years ago by the young Winston Churchill to a New York politician of the time, Bourke Cockran. "The duty of government," Churchill said, "is to be first of all practical. I am for makeshifts and expediency. I would like to make the people who live on this world at the same time as I do better fed and happier generally. If incidentally I benefit posterity—so much the better—but I would not sacrifice my own generation to a principle however high or a truth however great."

Such an approach may seem too modest—even, perhaps, too cynical—for those ideological statesmen whose self-righteousness has adorned our age—those confident moralists prepared with the deepest conscience and commitment to sacrifice their generation on the altar of their own metaphors. But history, never wholly silent, raises questions about the infallibility of their historical models, whether positive or negative—questions about both the all-encompassing ideology and the single analogy. Far from enabling us to look piercingly into the future, history, if we read it aright, offers us an even more valuable gift: it makes us—or should make us—understand the extreme difficulty, the intellectual peril, the moral arrogance of supposing that the future will yield itself so easily to us.

Properly understood, history must lead statesmen to a profound and humbling sense of human frailty—to a recognition of the fact, so often and so tragically destructive of our most sacred certitudes, that the possibilities of history are far richer and more various than the human intellect is likely to conceive—this; and the final understanding that, despite the limitations of our knowledge and the obscurity of our situation, we are never relieved from the necessity of meeting our responsibilities. Freedom and fatality: still the essence of the human condition.

MORE DISSENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the dissent from our policies in southeast Asia continues—and properly so. It is rising. It takes the form of analyses of official presentations and of recommendations for new and untried approaches to a cessation of the slaughter and to peace.

A pertinent example of the former is found in Walter Lippmann's column entitled "An Old Slogan," published in the Washington Post of July 26.

An example of the latter is the leading editorial, entitled "New Opportunity in Vietnam," published in the New York Times of July 26.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: AN OLD SLOGAN

(By Walter Lippmann)

Campaigning in the Middle West the President has used as one of his main theses the cry that the war in Vietnam is a war to end wars like the one in Vietnam. "If guerrilla warfare succeeds in Asia," he said, "it can also succeed in Africa and Latin America as well." This is precisely what we all said during the First World War. That war was "a war to end war." To hear that old slogan brought out again is, to say the least, creepy. For not only did the First World War not end war, as a matter of fact it sowed the ground for the Second World War.

Presumably the President means what he is saying. But it is hard to think that anyone can believe that the outcome in Vietnam will determine whether there are guerrilla wars "in Africa and Latin America," or even in other parts of Asia. Are we really supposed to believe that the future of guerrilla warfare, that is to say of rebellion, will be determined by what happens in Vietnam?

What is the connection between the guerrilla wars waged in Ireland, Palestine, Armenia, Macedonia, Croatia, Crete, Algeria, the Congo? Were not these uprisings separate events? How can anyone deceive himself with the notion that uprisings all over the globe have some kind of underground common instigator and that they can be suppressed and discouraged by what happens in one small corner of the world?

Fifty years ago when the cry of "a war to end war" was first heard, it was used to inspire people who, themselves remote from the fighting, needed a motive to keep on with the battle. The slogan was invented by an Englishman to arouse the insular British and the isolationist Americans who, not being under fire, saw no clear vital interests which they were defending.

Mr. Johnson has dusted off the old war slogan because it is not easy to prove to the American people that they are fighting for a vital interest of the United States. In the First World War the United States did have a vital interest, which was to prevent the conquest of Great Britain and France and to keep open the Atlantic connection with Europe. This was a difficult thing to explain in the excitement of a war, and in lieu of a true explanation of the issues of the war we fell back upon the slogan of a war to end war.

In Asia the United States does indeed have a vital interest in preventing the conquest of the Asian mainland and of the islands and archipelagoes of the western Pacific. But there is no convincing reason for thinking that the war in Vietnam as it has now developed, is vital to the American interests in the world. The American position has always been that our interest in Asia must be defended and promoted without America becoming involved in such a land war as is now raging in Vietnam.

President Johnson sustained his argument about a war to end guerrilla war with loud protestations about the firmness of our intentions to preserve and to defeat guerrilla warfare. Is he sure that what people see happening in Vietnam convinces them of this? Does the deeper and deeper involvement in Vietnam indicate that we would put equal effort into another antiguerrilla war on some other continent? Or does the Vietnamese affair indicate that we would not be able to fight two or three such wars at the same time?

This is another reason for wanting to believe that this one disagreeable war, this one ever-expanding war, is the last and only war that will have to be fought. But to want to believe this does not make it believable.

[From the New York Times, July 26, 1966]

NEW OPPORTUNITY IN VIETNAM

President Ho Chi Minh's statement that there is "no trial in view" for American military prisoners in North Vietnam is a victory for the moral influence of world opinion. That victory transcends the fate of the captive airmen, for it offers hope that common sense and common humanity ultimately may prevail against the ever greater barbarism the war in Vietnam daily inflicts on both sides.

The United States has yielded to the pressure of world opinion in the past by offering peace proposals and twice suspending the bombing of North Vietnam. But this is the first time that Hanoi has shown regard for the opinion of mankind. Its decision to back away from talk of "war crimes trials" follows direct pleas from Secretary General Thant, Pope Paul VI, numerous governments and opinion leaders everywhere, including eighteen liberal American Senators. The hope now must be that reason can prevail on the broader issues of the war itself.

The conflict in Vietnam is a political struggle that, in the end, can only be resolved by political means. In politics, timing is of the essence. A number of opportunities to probe the prospects for peace have been neglected in the past. It is vital that the new atmosphere and the new opportunity opened by Hanoi's response on the prisoner issue not be missed as well.

The approach favored by American moderates and long urged by The Times has just been summed up admirably by Prof. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. One essential element is to stop the Americanization of the war by halting the American buildup in South Vietnam; a quarter of a million American troops is more than enough. The second vital element is a civilian Government in Saigon that can open contact with the insurgent forces. Third, is the need to build an atmosphere conducive to negotiations by tapering off the bombing of North Vietnam. Finally, efforts to reconvene the Geneva conference must be linked with broad diplomatic discussions with Moscow, Paris and other interested states to find a formula for the neutralization and economic development of Southeast Asia as a whole.

Most of all, what is needed is a clear indication that the American objective is not military victory but political settlement. The American ability to escalate the war needs no further demonstration. The need now is to halt the escalation and make a vigorous new effort to achieve peace.

DELAWARE STARTS CIVIL RIGHTS SUIT IN SUPREME COURT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Wednesday, July 20, may well go down in the history books as one of the most memorable and significant dates in American history.

In an epochal action, the State of Delaware last Wednesday asked the Supreme Court of the United States to declare unconstitutional the system under which all of a State's electoral votes are cast for the presidential candidate

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

drawing the most popular vote, thus destroying the civil rights of those voting in the minority, since their votes in opposition are actually added to the votes cast for the winner so that the entire electoral vote of a State is cast, en bloc, for the victorious candidate.

This unique suit also points out in its highly persuasive brief that the civil rights of all American citizens who should have not only an equal right to vote but who should be entitled to have that vote counted with equality with every other vote cast by every other citizen are seriously impaired and prejudiced by the prevailing method of recording electoral votes. In fact, as it now operates, the electoral system records the single vote of an individual citizen in New York State as having more than 14 times the weight and the importance of the single vote cast by an individual citizen in the State of Delaware. No other factor except the accident of geographic residence provides for the unconscionable disparity in counting and evaluating the votes cast by American citizens for the President and Vice President of their choice.

Mr. President, under the prevailing system only the voters of New York State can be considered as first-class citizens. All other citizens of all other States are relegated downward in their citizenship status with Californians being "almost first-class citizens" and with every individual voter in every other State being markedly a "lower class citizen" until we get down to the smaller States whose citizens have only one-fifth, or one-tenth, or less than one-fourteenth the status and standing of the voter in the State of New York.

In fact, it is exactly as though a citizen in New York State were permitted to vote 14 times for President while a citizen of Delaware were permitted to vote 3 times, since an individual voter in New York State moves 14 electoral votes into the Presidential voting computations while a voter in Delaware by his vote moves only 3 electoral votes into the computations of the electoral college. Similarly, voters of all other States are penalized and downgraded by the inequities and injustices of the present electoral system which the suit of the State of Delaware now seeks to correct by its appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

In its memorable decision on the so-called Alabama reapportionment case of June 15, 1964, usually alluded to as Reynolds against Sims, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the prevailing opinion written by Mr. Chief Justice Warren said:

If a State should provide that the votes of citizens of one part of the State should be given two times, or five times, or ten times the weight of votes of citizens in another part of the State, it could hardly be contended that the right to vote of those residing in the disfavored areas had not been effectively diluted. . . . It is inconceivable that a State law to the effect that, in counting votes for legislators, the votes of citizens in one part of the State would be multiplied by two, five, or ten, while the votes of persons in another area would be counted only at face value, could be constitutionally sustainable.

Mr. President, I submit that it is likewise constitutionally unsustainable to permit citizens voting for President to multiply by as much as 14 their votes cast for President.

Every State in the Union having more than a single member in the House of Representatives has been made a defendant in this suit by the State of Delaware. Already this historic suit is attracting much publicity in the press and periodicals of our Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article published under a three-column headline in the Minneapolis Tribune of July 21, 1966.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE SUES TO VOID U.S. ELECTORAL SYSTEM

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The State of Delaware asked the Supreme Court Wednesday to declare unconstitutional the system under which all of a state's electoral votes are cast for the presidential candidate drawing most of the popular vote.

Invoking the court's original jurisdiction to hear disputes between states, Atty. Gen. David P. Buckson of Delaware brought suit against all the other 49 states and the District of Columbia. However, he directed his legal attack specifically at New York and other states with large blocks of electoral votes.

The suit charged that a citizen of a large state exerted more political influence than a citizen of a small state because, theoretically at least, he is capable of delivering a decisive number of electoral votes.

It asks the high court to extend its one-man, one-vote doctrine to declare unconstitutional the winner-take-all or "unit vote" system of choosing presidential electors.

All states now use the unit vote system, but neither the Constitution nor federal law requires it.

According to the suit, in the early years of the republic a majority of the states used the district system to choose electors.

This method gave an electoral vote to the candidate that carried each congressional district, with each state's two senatorial electoral votes going to the candidate who carried the state.

But a few states were able to exert additional political influence by giving all their electoral votes to the candidate who carried the states, and this forced all the other states to adopt the same system, the suit said.

The result is that at present the electoral votes of the 11 largest states, plus that of any one other state, are enough to win a presidential election. These 11 states are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, Michigan, New Jersey, Florida, Massachusetts and Indiana.

A majority, of 270 of the 538 electoral votes, is necessary to elect a president.

The defendants were listed in this descending order, extending down to the smallest states. Thus the suit is entitled Delaware v. New York, and is in fact directed at these 11 states.

Buckson said in a news conference that other small states are expected to realign themselves on the plaintiff side of the case.

New York citizens have also benefitted unduly from the unit vote system by having a great chance to become president, the suit contends.

Of the 100 men nominated for president or vice president, 24 have been New Yorkers, while no citizen of Delaware has ever been nominated for either office, and Delaware and 35 other states have never had one of their citizens elected president.

"Citizens of these states are as well qualified for national office as are New York's citizens," the suit contended, but they have been overlooked because of "the premium placed upon the strategic location of potential candidates residing in New York and other large states."

In 1960, it pointed out, John F. Kennedy received 67.5 per cent of the combined electoral college votes of Illinois and Indiana when he carried Illinois by a whisker and got its 27 electoral votes. Richard M. Nixon received 51.6 per cent of the combined electoral college votes which got only Indiana's 13 electoral votes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is a fair and objective substitute for the inequitable electorial college situation of which Deleware rightfully complains. A number of us in Congress have for many years been advocating a constitutional amendment which would return this country to the so-called district system of choosing our Presidential electors which was intended by our constitutional forefathers and which, in fact, was used in this Republic during the first several presidential campaigns of this country's history. It was changed to the winner-take-all, en-bloc, method of choosing electors only because some early-day politicians with partisan ambitions had it altered by acts of their State legislatures to secure added political power for their respective States and this, of course, in self-defense compelled other States to follow the new, nonrepresentative pattern.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senate Joint Resolution 12, which is now before Congress, be printed at this point in my remarks. It is to be noted it has widespread, bipartisan support. It has been the subject of much testimony before the so-called Birch Bayh Subcommittee Studying Electoral College Reform. In a somewhat different version, it once was approved by a majority of the Senate, but it lacked necessary two-thirds vote at the time. However, additional support has developed for the proposal since that test vote. In my opinion, this so-called district plan, which gives every voter in America—regardless of where he lives—precisely the same "votepower" in the naming of a President solves the evils of the current electoral college system without injecting any new evils of its own. I commend it to the continued study of Congress and the country.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 12

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of President and Vice Presi-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

My resolution would avoid problems by establishing regular—and I believe proper—procedures for considering original resolutions reported by committees as well as resolutions amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting new language, the subject matter of which is predominantly within the jurisdiction of another committee. I hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will be able to schedule hearings on the proposal this session. It may be that such hearings would reveal ways in which it can be modified and strengthened. I am concerned with the principle involved. I believe there should be a provision in the Senate rules to cover this matter. It should not be necessary for the Senate to vote up or down each original resolution reported by a committee which involves the jurisdiction of another committee. Nor is it the way to conduct the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will give me and those of us who are interested in this subject an opportunity to be heard.

I thank the majority leader for this opportunity to speak.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a pleasure, I say to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"3. All original bills or resolutions proposed to be reported shall be introduced and referred to the appropriate standing committee before being placed on the Calendar of Business. A proposed report on a bill or resolution with a committee amendment to strike out all after the enacting or resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof new language, the subject matter of which predominantly is within the jurisdiction of another committee, shall be referred to such other committee and reported therefrom before it shall be printed on the Calendar of Business for Senate consideration."

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, objections have been lodged with the minority leadership. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Gen. Nguyen Kao Ky, provisional premier of South Vietnam, has recently stated to the American people that the requirements of victory in Vietnam compel a ground invasion of North Vietnam. Furthermore, he believes that "we" as "free men" ought to go to war now with China since we will have to do so, in any event, in 5 or 10 years.

General Ky's right to say whatever he pleases is recognized. His right to bind the United States thereby ought to be rejected in equally unmistakable terms.

It so happens that Gen. Nguyen Kao Ky is a northern Vietnamese. It is quite proper for him to desire the reunification of Vietnam, which, as some of us have stated, is basically one culture, north and south, with many shadings. It is quite proper for him to want to go back home to North Vietnam, where he was born and where he grew up and did his initial soldiering with the French colonial forces. It is quite proper for him to believe he must fight the Chinese, if it is necessary for him to get there and stay there.

What is not proper, what is most improper, is for the United States to permit itself to be placed by General Ky in a position which requires us not only to use our strength to protect the provisional Ky government in South Vietnam but to carry General Ky back home to North Vietnam on the shoulders of our marines and infantry. What is not proper is for us to incur tens of thousands of additional U.S. casualties to help General Ky realize his ambitions.

What is not proper is for the United States to have any aim in this war except peace, a peace equitable and restrained, and at the soonest possible moment. That is where the American interest lies, wherever General Ky's interests may extend and whatever they may be.

We have already put upward of 270,000 Americans into Vietnam in order to do most of the frontline fighting there while, in accordance with General Ky's desires, he concentrates on organizing the rear. It would be, and I choose the word most advisedly, an abomination to move this already questionable battle order into North Vietnam in order to accommodate General Ky.

It seems to me that this Government has only one course here and that is, to dissociate itself completely and at once from General Ky's statement, which is his own business, and to reiterate clearly that the commitment of this Nation is to the people of South Vietnam and to the kind of political order which they can and will in time and in freedom choose for themselves. To accept for ourselves a concept of this war, such as that advanced by General Ky, would appear to be at the gravest variance with the interests and the policies of the United States and with the basis on which this war has heretofore been supported.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding to me. I commend the majority leader for what he has said.

When I awoke this morning and found that there had emerged a great new leader for the Western democracies in the person of General Ky I did not know whether to swell with pride or to tremble with apprehension. I decided that it would be better to let Russia and China do the trembling and perhaps we should be rather proud that we have done so much to develop this new leadership.

It is very possible that after he takes care of Russia and China and North Vietnam, perhaps we could ask his advice as to what we should do in the United States where we are having virtually organized insurrection in our cities, where we have strikes in our most critical industries and where there is no home building or home purchasing possible because the banks are putting their money into channels other than mortgages or homes.

Perhasps he could advise us about the financing of our own Government, which I understand today is in a rather precarious situation.

I do not know just what we might give in return for the advice and leadership which is now available to us. Possibly we could contribute more American troops to start with, but as to what the ultimate number should be, I have no knowledge—possibly a contribution of 5 million would suffice since with competent leadership and direction our quota could be held to a minimum.

As I say, let us leave it to Russia and China to do the trembling. They have wanted us to make a bigger effort in Vietnam so that in 2 years we will be more thoroughly bogged down and they will be in a position to undertake a war of any size and kind. Now, let them worry.

As I have said, I thank the majority leader for calling our attention to this change in leadership, and it is up to each of us to decide whether he will swell with pride or tremble with apprehension for fear of what it might bring about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to my distinguished friend that if we were to follow General Ky's advice, we would directly presume to be an Asiatic power

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 26, 1966 No. 120

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, July 22, 1966)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, we recognize a basic essential of life for prayer at the beginning of this session of the U.S. Senate.

This moment of prayer is for the sincere purpose of invoking divine blessing and guidance upon one of the highest of government assemblies

Prayer is offered today, O God, because of the sense of personal need. We are grateful for leaders who have a consciousness of heavy responsibility. We know that Thou art with them; even through this prayer and their personal meditations, deliberations, and decisions. Be Thou their guide and strength.

Be with our President and the world leaders. Give men of the governments of the world sincere desire and insight to the way of peace, we pray sincerely in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 26, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KUCHEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July, 25, 1966, was dispensed with.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, 1966

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the amendment offered by Senator MORSE now the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The amendment offered by Senator MORSE is now the order of business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pending the arrival of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] may speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REFERRAL OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for giving me this opportunity. I shall be very brief.

Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to provide that all original bills or resolutions proposed to be reported shall be introduced and referred to the appropriate Senate committee before being placed on the Calendar of Business. I do so in light of the situation which recently developed on the floor when the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee reported an original resolution from that committee and asked for its consideration, without its having been referred to the Armed Services Committee, which has jurisdiction over the subject matter involved.

In response to a question first raised by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] the Vice President said that had the resolution been introduced in the customary way, it would have been referred to the Armed Services Committee. He emphasized, however, that this was his informal opinion given to a hypothetical question. Later, as a result of a point of order made by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] when the question arose of whether the resolution as reported from the Foreign Relations Committee had to be referred to the Armed Services Committee, the Vice President ruled that there was no precedent, and left the matter to the Senate to decide.

I think the Senate made the proper decision in that instance, but I do not believe it should be faced with such a question again. As it now stands, the precedent is that the matter should be referred to the Senate for a vote. I think the issue involved in that situation is too important to be left unclear. It should be spelled out in the rules. We know that in instances such as the one recently before us, the House of Representatives has procedures which would prevent the floor action proposed by the supporters of the original resolution. I do not believe this matter should be left open to doubt in this body, either.

I believe that my resolution will be helpful. If a committee is allowed to extend its jurisdiction into areas traditionally within the jurisdiction of other committees, all subjects may be "up for grabs," so to speak. No committee can feel secure that the jurisdiction it possesses today will not have to be shared tomorrow with another committee which asserts its desire to extend its traditional jurisdiction to cover other subjects. This could be done without hearings and without providing an opportunity to consider the views of the committees which traditionally have had jurisdiction over the subject in question. There would, of course, be an opportunity for discussion on the Senate floor, but such matters should first be given careful consideration with adequate opportunity for all interested parties to be heard.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

which is something I do not think we should do under any circumstances. I believe that we should stay with our historic position which goes back beyond the time when we were an Atlantic power, in reality. We should remain, on the other side of the world, a Pacific power, and not try to stretch ourselves into being an Asian power.

Our interests are on the fringes and borders of the Western Pacific Ocean, but not deep in the mainland of Asia. We are not in Vietnam to become and we should not seek to become an Asiatic power.

Mr. AIKEN. There is nothing like a conference in the mid-Pacific to develop the greatest leadership in the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with the majority leader and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in what they have said. I rise to underline the words of the majority leader, which I think are the key words of importance today, and that is to dissociate this Government from the assertions of General Ky.

The origin of the present situation is Honolulu, and the situation has now come full circle with General Ky representing a position into which the United States might be thrown.

I wish to pay my tribute to the majority leader for calling the turn on it. I hope very much that this position is followed by our Government in calling the turn on General Ky.

It is high time that General Ky found that he does not speak for the United States and that he cannot impliedly speak for the United States because he represents, for the time being, the Government of South Vietnam.

Second, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] emphasized, our responsibility is to the people of South Vietnam, so long as they demonstrate a hunger for freedom and the will to fight for it. If we find that these factors have changed, I say that we do not belong there.

Third, it demonstrates that we must push with all of the effort that we have and all the influence that we have for a duly elected, legitimate civilian government. As long as there is a military junta running South Vietnam, this kind of irresponsibility becomes possible.

I think that the majority leader has shown time and again his complete probity in these matters of foreign policy by taking positions of this kind.

I honor the majority leader for taking the position that he has today. I hope that it is followed by our Government. I think that it is the only way in which the implications of Honolulu—where, it has been said, the United States put its arm around General Ky—can be ended.

General Ky has provided us a splendid opportunity and it should be taken advantage of.

I congratulate the majority leader for for his great exercise of responsibility today and the leadership which he has demonstrated.

UNITED STATES MUST DISAVOW PREMIER KY'S EFFORTS TO EXPAND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. President, in recent weeks leaders of the military junta in Saigon, and in particular Premier Ky, have made statements and stated objectives that are both dangerous and contrary to the aims of U.S. policy in Asia. If the United States is to maintain and strengthen the credibility of its peace position, we must disavow those dangerous objectives as expressed by the Saigon leaders.

The latest of these statements is reported in today's New York Times. Quoting from an interview with Premier Ky from U.S. News & World Report, the article indicates that Premier Ky wants the United States to face the Communist Chinese now. "Sooner or later we, as freemen, have to face the Chinese Communist. I think it is better to face them right now than in 5 or 10 years."

Last week, Premier Ky called for an Allied invasion of North Vietnam.

In previous weeks Ky has repeatedly stated that his government, or indeed any South Vietnamese Government over which he has any control, would never under any circumstances, negotiate with the National Liberation Party.

All three of these aims are dangerously out of line with U.S. policy. It is not enough for the United States simply to ignore these remarks. Silence is not sufficient disavowal. If Premier Ky's remarks are ignored by us, other nations cannot help but believe that he is expressing objectives which we ourselves hold but choose not to state publicly.

There is no reason for us to fear the consequences of challenging Premier Ky in these matters. The United States should not allow the military junta to maneuver us into a position where we are made to feel that any public disagreement between our Government and the one in Saigon will result in the toppling of the present Saigon government.

If we act only by silence now, then we will increasingly lose control over events that happen to us in Vietnam. We may soon find that no reasonable negotiating position and no peace offensive are acceptable to the military junta. U.S. interests are at stake in Vietnam and American troops are fighting there, but those interests and those men should never be a party to a war without an end or to a massive Asian land war.

I urge the Government of the United States to restate our negotiating position, to reaffirm U.S. desire for peace, and to disavow any objectives stated by the Saigon government which run counter to our own.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add my comments to the discussion to which I have just listened.

The other day the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations engaged in a colloquy as to our responsibilities in Asia, and as to whether we were an Asian power, and all that that implied.

At that time I rose and spoke briefly and said that I believed our position there was one of a military character to make it possible for us to have greater safety for our own citizens and more security in our own country.

We are doing that with the idea that if we help South Vietnam to establish a government of their own, then we will have more security and safety here for our own citizens.

If we are to extend our responsibility, as suggested by General Ky, into other areas of Asia, we only decrease our opportunities for security and safety of our own citizens and increase our military responsibilities. In substance we spread our efforts too widely to be effective.

I certainly join with my colleagues who have spoken this morning on that subject, and I commend the majority leader for having emphasized the need for keeping our responsibilities to the original purpose of making it possible for the South Vietnamese to establish their own government which, I understand, is what we are trying to do and what we hope we will succeed in doing in our efforts there.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, what has been said in this Chamber this morning should have been said.

The majority leader, and those who have followed, spoke for the American people and for this Government.

General Ky does not speak for the people of the United States, nor for the Government of the United States.

On this occasion, I think that members of the executive branch should join responsible Members of Congress in speaking out and saying so.

I very much doubt that the world misunderstands. My judgment is that the position of the American people has been made clear over the past months and years. I think that Communist China clearly understands the goal of the Government of the United States and what it seeks in southeast Asia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] may be recognized for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLEVELAND RAKES COALS OF RACIAL VIOLENCE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent days, on the East Side of the city of Cleveland where I have lived in the past, there have been acts of violence and killing of innocent people. In the Hough Avenue area, where some years ago I made my home with my wife and little children, Negroes, frustrated no doubt by neglect, have resorted to acts of violence. Stores have been looted and burned, abandoned, and neglected.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Apartments and old dwellings have been destroyed by fire, stores looted of merchandise, and four or more citizens have been killed. Hundreds have been wounded by gunfire or brutally beaten. This is not at all the result of any conspiracy, Communist inspired or otherwise.

Obviously one of the causes of the rioting in Cleveland is the terribly inadequate and long-neglected housing condition throughout the Hough Avenue area. The indignities of ghetto life are distressing and the routine rat-filled houses of the slums appalling. The neglect of this entire area is inexcusable. Church and community leaders in Cleveland should accelerate efforts on a nonprofit housing program not only for the Hough area but for other East Side areas of Cleveland. Then, we in the Congress have a duty to enact into law more effective programs to back up and aid efforts of communities to provide adequate housing.

Violence that has occurred in my home city is also taking place in many other cities throughout the Nation, particularly in northern cities which have tolerated what could be termed "Negro ghettoes." We are witnessing explosions in various cities in various sections of our country, both north and south of the Mason-Dixon line. This is an explosion of pent-up frustrations, unemployment, and hopelessness of those living in neglected neighborhoods.

Mayor Ralph Locher of Cleveland, when our police force was unable to cope with the rioting, requested that National Guard units be sent in to restore law and order. Governor Rhodes complied. Elements of the Ohio National Guard, to the extent of approximately 2,000 men, are in this East Side Hough Avenue area establishing road blockades and barricades and enforcing a curfew seeking to end rioting and the killing and injuring of men, women, and children. In most part, objects of destruction by Negro youth in the Hough Avenue area have been stores and property largely owned and operated by absentee owners. Store windows have been smashed, stores looted, apartment buildings burned.

In Cleveland many of the young men, members of the National Guard suddenly called in, frightened of the terror and violence, seemed unable to quell the rioting and to prevent women, children, and men from being injured. In fact, in some instances the guardsmen, unaccustomed to handling weapons in combat, appeared trigger happy.

Mr. President, nearly one-third of the large population of the city of Cleveland consists of Negroes. We have always taken pride in the fact that our city is truly a melting pot. We have believed that our population of various and diverse ethnic origin, Slovenian, Hungarian, Polish, Italian, German, and nationals of other countries of the Old World who came here themselves or whose fathers and mothers settled in Cleveland away from the prejudices and oppressions of the Old World, came in search of political and religious liberty and found it in Cleveland. Perhaps we were wrong in our high hopes.

In this administration of Mayor Ralph Locher there are considerably more than 2,000 men on the Cleveland police force. Yet, of this large number only 137 are Negroes. This in a city where 33 percent of the population is Negro. Furthermore, it has seemed evident that some members, a minority but a substantial minority, of our police force conducted themselves with brutality and a lack of intelligence in trying to cope with unruly crowds who were rioting. In Cleveland, where the 31 members of our city council are elected and not appointed, as are members of the police force, 10 are Negroes. The majority leader of the city council is a respected Negro leader, Charles V. Carr, who has been elected as councilman from his ward for many years.

In the cabinet of the mayor of Cleveland two of the nine directors are Negroes. There are 13 municipal court judges. Of these 13, 2 Negroes have been repeatedly elected to the court. There are 23 Cuyahoga County common pleas court judges, and only 1 is a Negro. Governor Rhodes of Ohio has within the past 2 or 3 years made a number of appointments to the common pleas court of Cuyahoga County. He has made good appointments, but not one has been a Negro. Ohio courts afford a citizen the right of one trial and one review. The court of appeals of the Cleveland area has six judges, one of whom is a Negro. It is deeply saddening that in a great industrial and beautiful city such as Cleveland respect for the laws of our land which American citizens should defend and respect have been flouted and disregarded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 7 minutes have expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. However, it is difficult to convince a Negro living with eight or nine others in a one-room flat amid rats and disease in Cleveland's Hough area that abstract constitutional ideals have any meaning to him. His immediate needs are food, a roof over his head, and employment.

I deplore the violence which is exploding throughout Cleveland. However, I am thoroughly convinced that much more of the same is to come unless strong corrective measures are taken. It is no solution to beat back rioters with clubs or tear gas. Such action, merely generates more violence and destruction in a spiral which ends in ruin and more bitter memories, which, given a spark, will explode out all over again.

It was hoped that the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 would provide some answers. Unfortunately, that act has failed to fulfill the high hopes held out for it at its enactment. The programs sound good but the targets have been set far too low. Yet the Economic Opportunity Act has given rise to some very beneficial programs directed toward our urban poor. Only Federal action on a large scale can strike to the heart of this urban dilemma. I am hopeful that meaningful changes will be made this session to rid the war on poverty of its deadwood. For example, Federal funds for the elimination of poverty must be taken from the hands of the politicians in some of our cities who have been appointed to high-salaried positions and who have done very little for the poor and unemployed.

The housing program is too small. The poverty program is too small. The program for slum schools is too small. It is not the riots in the slums but these lame and inadequate programs that are the real disgrace of the richest nation on earth.

It is clear that the elimination of slum misery will require new programs and much money. We as legislators must act with determination in providing the wherewithal to rub out conditions in slum neighborhoods which give rise to the ugly rioting which has racked our cities over this summer. We must be determined in this task. The handwriting is clearly written on the battered walls of Cleveland, Chicago, and other great cities of our Nation.

Cleveland is my home city. It is a matter of pride with me that from 1911 when I moved to Cleveland from the small city of Norwalk, Ohio, right up to the time I was elected to the Senate in 1958, I practiced law in Cleveland and lived in the Cleveland area. My neighbors there, including many thousands of Negro citizens, have been good and generous to me every time I sought elective political office.

Years ago my wife, children, and I lived in the Hough Avenue area close to where the worst of this terrible rioting occurred.

We in the Congress and very definitely the city officials of Cleveland, from Mayor Locher down, have neglected people living in this area and have permitted it to deteriorate into a miserable slum where many thousands live in the midst of filth, stench of overcrowding and lack of toilet facilities and where children are crowded into dark and filthy tenements and compelled to play in streets and where young men and young girls, even to have a breath of fresh air, are compelled to walk outside to escape the heat and fetid air of the tenements. In this hopeless situation and in the continuing heat of some July nights, hindsight tells us that the explosion, was inevitable.

Four deaths resulted and hundreds of men, women and children were badly injured. The damage to buildings and property will reach a million dollars. This was the worst rioting in the entire history of Cleveland. It was replete with looting, gunfire and sniping. Even some narrowminded white men considered themselves self-appointed vigilantes now stand accused of the murder of a young Negro husband and father who had not participated one iota in any rioting.

George Barmann, an outstanding news reporter on the staff of the Plain Dealer—a man who is noted in Ohio as an objective and talented news reporter—wrote a fine news column which was published in the Christian Science Monitor under the caption, "Cleveland Rakes Coals of Racial Violence." Mr. President,

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

thing one has to offer. I believe in everything that I am doing and will give my all—as I feel this is a true threat to my family's freedom as well as my country's, and I will defend our flag as long as I am able and will always feel I have saved my children from going through the "hell" these kids are here.

Defense Pattern Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, increasingly expressions of concern are being heard across the Nation concerning the adequacies of defense planning by the administration.

One such expression of concern is contained in the July 20, 1966, issue of the Glendale, Calif., News-Press.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the Glendale News-Press editorial for inclusion in the RECORD. I believe the position taken in the editorial and in the comments it contains will be of interest to the Congress:

NEW SHORTAGE IS OLD STORY: DEFENSE PATTERN ALARMING

Testimony of Gen. James P. McConnell, Air Force chief of staff, that the Tactical Air Command is down to "bedrock" in strength sends a ripple of alarm through the nation.

General McConnell says the shortages are so serious that trouble elsewhere than Viet Nam would result in a call-up of the Air National Guard and disrupt vital training.

It is not a new story so far as the Defense Department has been concerned recently.

There have been persistent and verified shortages of vehicles, helicopters, aircraft parts, certain weight bombs and even clothing in Viet Nam. A Senate subcommittee, after a study, listed 29 items in short supply in the critical war area.

The shortages were verified after vehement dissent from Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who labeled such information "baloney." "Never have ground operations been so well supported by air," he said. True, perhaps, but an evasion of the fact that supplies were short.

Later, after newspaper reports and investigations by members of congress it was learned that fully half of the four U.S. combat divisions in the United States were not ready for combat, but engaged in training. All "ready reserve" battalions were earmarked for Viet Nam or other U.S. commitments.

Then, at the height of a crisis in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the secretary of defense withdrew 15,000 troops, mostly highly skilled technicians, from Europe without first consulting our allies. The withdrawal came shortly after his comment that it is "absolutely false to say we are overextended and cannot meet our military requirements."

Additionally, of course, Congress and key military leaders are concerned that there is no anti-missile defense in operation, that no program exists for a follow-up bomber to the obsolescent B–52, at cutbacks in the Strategic Air Command and refusal of the Defense Department to construct nuclear frigates authorized by Congress to speed a nuclear surface Navy.

The pattern is clear evidence that, regardless of Mr. McNamara's background of management, the matter of defense is too critical to be left to the decisions of a single man. No one should have this kind of power. Rather, defense should be a co-operative effort that includes Congress and the experienced wisdom of our military leaders.

Only time and a careful analysis of the secretary's claim that he has saved $14 billion in defense over the last four years will prove whether this is fact.

It can be said now, however, that "savings" are a misnomer if the nation's defenses have been weakened or a war effort is slowed down by a lack of supplies.

Wars cannot be fought with short supplies and a missile that has not been built cannot be fired.

How the Vietnam Problem Was Neatly Solved, or * * *

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIM LEE CARTER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post often carries thought-provoking articles. In the issue of July 30, 1966, I found this interesting observation of the Vietnam situation, written by Russell Baker:

THE HUMAN COMEDY: HOW THE VIETNAM PROBLEM WAS NEATLY SOLVED, OR * * *

(By Russell Baker)

Until 10:32 p.m. when the direct phone from Saigon rang in the White House, September 17, 1971, had been just another day in Washington.

Once again President Johnson had urged the nation to be patient about the Vietnamese war. Secretary of Defense McNamara that afternoon had issued his semiannual declaration that the Viet Cong were no longer winning.

At the State Department, Secretary Rusk had assured the press that despite widespread riots and library burnings, there was every reason to believe that Gen. Quang Cai Quec, who had seized power three weeks before, would at last give South Vietnam a long period of governmental stability.

Mr. Rusk said that Gen. Quec might even agree soon to take some of the South Vietnamese army out of pagodas and put them into battle alongside the Americans.

The White House phone call was from the American ambassador. "General Quec wants an island," he said.

The presidential jet touched down at Honolulu 36 hours later. "What's this about an island?" the President asked Gen. Quec.

While the President and his advisers listened, the general explained. On the night of September 16, unable to get to sleep, he had slipped down to the kitchen of the presidential palace for a midnight snack, only to discover that the Viet Cong terrorists had been there just minutes before him and raided the icebox.

To govern a country under such conditions, he reasoned, was impossible. "You can't drive outside town without being kidnapped," he said. "The pagodas are packed with politicians, and there are so many overpaid GI's in Saigon that a premier can't even get a bad table in a restaurant anymore without slipping some piasters to the maitre d'. The trouble is that South Vietnam is located in the wrong place."

"Keep talking," said the President.

"I have loaded every available sampan with elements of my army," Gen. Quec said. "I propose to move offshore to the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam, where we can rally our strength for a victorious return to the mainland."

"And just where is the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam?" asked Mr. Rusk.

Gen. Quec smiled. "How about Catalina Island?" he asked.

Next morning, while Gen. Quec inspected Waikiki beach, the President's advisers came to grips with the question of Nationalist Vietnam. They stayed at grips all day, all the next day, and all through the day after that.

On the morning of the fourth day their conference was interrupted by Gen. Quec with the announcement that the first sampans carrying his army has beached on the island of Mai Tai, 60 miles off the Vietnamese coast, had seized Cum Quat, the capital, and had proclaimed it the seat of the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam.

"If you will excuse me, I must now meet with the press and vow to return to the mainland one of these days," Gen. Quec said.

"It will never work, General," said Secretary Rusk. "Look at what happened to Chiang Kai-shek."

The papers reported that Gen. Quec excused himself and exited laughing.

Instead of flying immediately to Cum Quat, Gen. Quec accepted a series of speaking engagements in the United States, where news of his stirring pledge to return to the mainland one of these days had made him an overnight hero.

Landing in San Francisco to a tumultuous reception, Quec promised that if the United States would only unleash him, he would send the Nationalist Vietnam Army lunging across of Gulf of Tonkin to provide military advisers to American armies and clear the Communists off the mainland.

For that eventual triumph, he told a joint session of Congress, the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam on Mai Tai would require massive American aid. Cum Quat, after all, was still only a provisional island town, he noted. It needed new factories and bomber strips. Vast sums would be required to build a Cum Quat Hilton and air-condition Cum Quat's bars for U.S. military, diplomatic, and aid teams when they arrived to defeat Communism.

Meanwhile, at the White House, the President's advisers struggled with the Mai Tai problem. "The question," said a man from Texas, "is whether we are are going to recognize Mai Tai as Vietnam."

"Unthinkable," said Secretary Rusk. "Mai Tai is only a two-bit island sixty miles off the Asian mainland."

"Impossible," said Secretary McNamara. "We already have a million-and-a-half American soldiers tied down on the mainland."

The man from Texas winked. "Suppose we stopped recognizing Vietnam as Vietnam," he said. "Suppose we said that the real Vietnam is on Mai Tai. What do we do with our soldiers?"

"Well," said Secretary Rusk, "since we are fighting to preserve the freedom of Vietnam, we would, of course, have to locate the soldiers wherever Vietnam may be."

"That would mean taking them off the mainland and putting them on Mai Tai," said Secretary McNamara.

Next day the United States announced that it had recognized the Republic of Nationalist Vietnam on Mai Tai and did not recognize anyplace else that called itself Vietnam.

At his news conference Mr. Rusk was asked if Americans would continue to fight on the mainland. "Since we do not recognize any Vietnam on the mainland, your question is absurd," he explained. "Obviously an army cannot preserve the freedom of a place that does not exist."

Which, as we all know, is how the fighting in Vietnam—mainland Vietnam, that is—finally ended. For a while it was expensive maintaining the American army on

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

is an America. There can be no escape from it.

How can the Negro obtain payment of this debt?

In order to obtain payment of this debt after 300 years of promises the Negro needs the help and strength of all other Americans just as all other Americans need the strength and help of the Negro.

For, despite its racial troubles, the United States is a nation of one people, and the Negro, representing only ten percent of the population, must never be deluded into thinking he can "go it alone" and force his will on the majority.

Nor can he afford to complacently accept persecution and abuse as an "outsider."

The Negro is an "insider." He is an integral part of an indivisible nation and he must never forget it.

He is not alone as an American, and his past history and future destiny have been and will be worked out in America through mutual coexistence with other Americans, working for a better America.

Thus the Negro needs the contributions of all black men and all black organizations in working toward his goal. He needs Dr. Martin Luther King of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, who can be compared to a "modern day Moses" attempting to lead his people out of the wilderness.

He also needs the leadership and contributions of Congressman Adam Clayton Powell; Roy Wilkins of the NAACP; Jack Greenberg, head of the NAACP Legal and Educational Defense Fund; A. Philip Randolph, the elder statesman; Whitney Young of the National Urban League; J. Raymond Jones, the political leader; Floyd McKissick of CORE; Miss Dorothy Height of the National Council of Negro Women; James Farmer, the ex-CORE leader; Stokely Carmichael of SNCC; James Lawson of the Black Nationalist Movement; Elijah Muhammad of the Black Muslims; and business leaders such as A. T. Spaulding of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company; T. M. Alexander of Atlanta; Joseph Davis, president, Carver Federal Savings and Loan Association; John H. Johnson, editor and publisher of Ebony Magazine; Carl Murphy, publisher Afro-American newspapers, and all other Negroes.

The solution of the Negro's problems also requires the leadership and contributions of that great reservoir of fair-minded white Americans in this country who have already contributed so much to the Negro's progress.

We refer to such men as President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, Senators KENNEDY, JAVITS, DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, Governor Rockefeller, former Mayor Wagner and Mayor Lindsay, and thousands of others including the courageous students, many of whom have given their lives for the cause.

All these people know that America owes a great debt to the Negro and they are the ones who stand ready to help America pay off that debt.

What the rest of this nation must now realize is that 22 million Negroes, keenly aware that this debt has been outstanding for more than 300 years, are now demanding payment, regardless of the consequences.

These Negroes know their rights and they know the laws passed by whites which guarantee them life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

They can no longer be fooled by persuasion and clever promises.

For, as Abraham Lincoln has so aptly said:

"You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Wake up America and remain great!

C. B. POWELL, M.D.,
Editor.

JAMES L. HICKS,
Executive Editor.

Captive Nations Week

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have this opportunity to rise in the commemoration of the eighth annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a week dedicated to bolster the determination and longing for freedom of the peoples in those many nations which have been tightly yoked under Communist oppression and intolerance. Compassion for the plight of these captive peoples is difficult for us Americans to fully feel, I fear, Mr. Speaker. The heritage of freedom of the press, freedom of speech, and freedom to worship is taken all too nonchalantly nowadays. It is easy for us to let our memories and our hearts gloss over the blood and the sweat and the tears that have embossed the pages of American history with our world fight for freedom.

As a sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 395, which I introduced on April 3, 1965, to give hope to the Baltic States in their sorrowful predicament, I am convinced that the annual Captive Nations Week can be a highly effective assistance in the movement toward independence in the Eastern European countries.

The various totalitarian Communist governments do not represent the downtrodden, underlying captive nations. A force that can help to penetrate this Communist barrier which separates the captive peoples from the realization of their long quest for freedom is an institution like Captive Nations Week. This week and others like it over the years will give courage to those who might otherwise lose all hope. It will serve as a reminder of freedom where heretofore the only reminder of freedom lay deeply submerged in the consciousness of a generation which once knew the joys of freedom but is rapidly aging under the yoke of totalitarianism.

The purpose of Captive Nations Week, and indeed the purpose of all free nations, should be the construction of a bridge of understanding sympathy. We should provide moral support and exert all possible efforts to help set free from Communist colonialism these oppressed and tyrannized captive nations.

When one reads of the shameful accusations by the Sino-Soviets of Yankee imperialism and compares them with the facts that are so incontrovertible, it is perfectly clear that Russia and China are the last two remnants that remain of the world's backward centers of colonial conquest.

The free world and those in bondage who learn for the free exercise of their former freedoms, look to the United States for leadership. They look upon the United States as their last citadel of hope, their last bastion for the cause of freedom. While we continue to remain strong, and champion the cause of those who are free and those who yearn to be free, we must continuously assert our leadership in that respect. Such leadership lies not only in the diplomatic and foreign policy efforts of free governments around the world but also in commemorations of freedom such as Captive Nations Week. This I believe to be the chief raison d'etre of the principles upon which this great Nation of ours is constructed.

A Letter From Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. E. C. Hogan, Sr., of Post, Tex., recently sent me a letter which she received from her nephew, Royce S. Bolding, who is serving in the Navy in Vietnam, indicating that she would like to share it with other Americans. The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the young men who serve our country in Vietnam, and I would like for others to have the opportunity of reading Mr. Bolding's letter also. I am, therefore, submitting excerpts from his letter of July 1, 1966, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Before I arrived here two months ago I wondered just what the heck did we want to fight over Viet-Nam for! Well, it didn't take this farm boy long to see what we were doing here—all I had to do was look around me—and I was proud of what my country was doing and much more so to be a part of it. These people here have been at a war of one sort or the other for over 30 years and have finally attained a semblance of a partial peace. In other words, they have more freedom now than they have ever known before. After working with them, visiting in their homes and fighting with them, I marvel at their determination and the great lengths they are willing to go to keep this newly found freedom. I have many Viet-Namese friends and really think they are great people.

Of course, all things can't always have only a bright side and it seems to me the home papers always manage to print the grim side of things. Granted the demonstrations, etc., that we had here not so long ago were truly very discouraging, but from an eye-witness's viewpoint here is how I look at it. Most of the Vietnamese are very uneducated. By this I mean they do not have the schooling or even the facilities to teach all the peasants here. I find that this class plus teenaged kids were for the most part the main body of these demonstrations. The kids were in it mostly for kicks, as when else would they ever have a chance to throw a rock, break a window, etc. There is no doubt also in my mind that there were North Vietnamese inspired to add to all this.

Just a little on the makeup of the land here. There are over 2,000 miles of navigable waterways in the delta alone during the monsoon season, and most of the land is either steaming hot jungles, rice paddies or mountains. Life is sheer hell here for the American, who is so used to his plush living, eating, and in general all his habits that he really suffers. However, after seeing one of these little kids break into a big smile and say, "You number 1 G.I.," it is worth every-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Mai Tai and converting Cum Quat into a place where Gen. Quang Cai Quec could live comfortably. With time, however, the job was done, the soldiers came home, and the Great Society was begun in earnest.

In his memoirs the President wrote that the only bad advice he received during the Mai Tai crisis came from the Secretary of the Treasury, who told him, "Mr. President, the one thing this country cannot afford is another Quang Cai Quec."

"History," wrote the President, "has proved him wrong. As long as we in this country can keep Asia confined to islands, we can live with it."

Horton Urges United States To Heed Prime Minister Pearson's Warning on Weakening NATO, Support for Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this will be the third time this year that I have stood before my colleagues in this Chamber to discuss the urgent need for American initiative in the Atlantic alliance. In the past few months, with NATO undergoing turbulence and change, our foreign policy makers have responded passively at best to the initiatives of European governments. Our most recent move was the announcement of a wholesale withdrawal of U.S. military units from France. There is no evidence that our Government views the obvious weakening of the alliance with any appropriate degree of concern. Even more alarming is the fact that outside of Congress, no one in Washington has taken any serious steps to plan for strengthening the alliance.

I believe that our leaders have made a tacit decision to step down from active and enlightened leadership of the North Atlantic nations. This fact became clear when the administration failed to react to Canada Prime Minister Pearson's speech in Springfield, Ill., last month, which was highly critical of America's failure to lead the alliance toward eventual Atlantic Union. Mr. Pearson said:

> France and not only France feels that Continental Europe is now strong enough to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the alliance.

Despite the fact that the United States of all nations should be aware of the changes in the international order since 1945, our NATO policies have remained nearly unchanged since the alliance was founded.

I am disturbed not only because there was no administration response to the Prime Minister's address, but also because Mr. Pearson hit on the weakest points of our Atlantic policies, and suggested the best possible course of action to strengthen the alliance. Our failure to respond indicates to me a lack of interest in improving the alliance. How can we while we are pursuing a conflict in southeast Asia to contain communism, fail to bolster the NATO organization which has been so successful in keeping Western Europe free without war?

My good friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois, thought enough of the Prime Minister's address to insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to add my own support to Mr. FINDLEY's proposal to actively consider the concept of Atlantic Union as a solution to the present trend of the NATO Alliance. I have introduced House Joint Resolution 999 to provide for U.S. participation in an Atlantic Union Convention with delegations from the other North Atlantic countries.

I think the need for such a move could not be stated more meaningfully than it was in the Prime Minister's own words:

> I believe only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity. Without her active support nothing can be done, at least on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress.

We cannot in conscience let this matter drop with passive American gestures at rebuilding the alliance. Only a few nights ago, I spoke about the need for new dimensions in our Atlantic policy to a large audience in Rochester, N.Y. Their concern for this matter was evident, as all Americans who cherish the unity of the free world are concerned about the weakening trend in our ties to Western Europe.

I urge my colleagues to study this matter closely, and to join Representative FINDLEY and myself in demanding an appropriate and constructive response to Prime Minister Pearson's remarks on the future of NATO.

At this point in the RECORD, I want to include three newspaper articles which point up the need for new directions in our free world foreign policy. The three newspapers, the Montreal Star, the New York Times, and the Baltimore Sun, are to be commended for their responsible reporting on this issue:

[From the Montreal (Canada) Star, June 16, 1966]

PEARSON SPEECH: WHITE HOUSE SILENCE FOLLOWS CRITICISM

(By Raymond Heard)

WASHINGTON.—Diplomats and interested members of Congress can't understand it. Lester Pearson came to the United States Saturday to attack American "domination" of the Atlantic Alliance. Yet there has been no reaction to the speech from the Johnson administration, which is very sensitive to criticism from its foreign friends.

However, it is predicted that the speech—regarded by many here and in Ottawa as one of the most outspoken anti-American declarations of Mr. Pearson's career—will have a delayed action effect. Sooner or later, the word will seep through to Lyndon Johnson that his "good neighbor" is behaving toward Washington rather like the Romanians are behaving toward Moscow.

As it is, to generate wider interest in the speech, Republican representative PAUL FINDLEY of Illinois has inserted the text into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. FINDLEY has also told this reporter: "There should have been a full debate here on the prime minister's speech. His remarks were both plain and wise. I can't recall an occasion when a foreign head of government has spoken quite so critically while on American ground."

FINDS SYMPATHY

Sen. FRANK CHURCH, the Idaho Democrat who went to Europe last month to inquire into the NATO crisis for Sen. J. W. FULBRIGHT'S Foreign Relations Committee, has asked for a copy of Mr. Pearson's text. When Sen. CHURCH conducts hearings into the NATO question later this month, the Pearson statement is expected to figure prominently in the discussion. For Mr. Pearson has suggested (among other things) that de Gaulle's complaints about U.S. domination of the alliance may be quite valid after all, and Sen. CHURCH, too, is reported to agree that the French president may have a point.

There is, meantime, some evidence that President Johnson has neither seen the Pearson speech nor heard about it, that the state department or the presidential aides, in the words of one Capitol Hill source, are hiding it from his view.

At a White House ceremony Tuesday for the signing of a bill authorizing the construction of a new dam for the Columbia River project, the president referred to Mr. Pearson as "my good friend." Johnson-watchers say that if the president had been aware of what Mr. Pearson had said in Springfield, Ill., Saturday he would not have paid him such a warm tribute. This may sound petty; but that's the way LBJ operates.

In his speech to the Atlantic Federal Union, the prime minister placed a major share of the blame for the current disarray of NATO on the United States rather than France, which the Johnson administration has cast in the role of "bad guy."

"France," the prime minister said, "is not, has not, and will not be satisfied with an Atlantic organization, or an Atlantic alliance of independent states dominated by America." His choice of the term "dominated" is regarded as very strong, at least for a professional diplomat of Mr. Pearson's experience.

Mr. Pearson made another remark that is sure to gall the president when he equated Washington's dominant position in NATO with that of Russia in the Warsaw Pact.

EARLIER TIFF

The total lack of an administration response (even in the way of inspired reports quoting "administration sources") to the Pearson speech is all the more surprising when viewed in the light of the Johnson-Pearson tiff over Viet Nam tactics at Camp David 14 months ago. The Prime Minister offended Mr. Johnson then by suggesting, ever so discreetly, that bombing of North Viet Nam might be suspended at "the right time."

If Mr. Pearson's remarks on Viet Nam last year gave comfort to the "doves," his Springfield speech about NATO has encouraged those in Congress, most of whom appear to be Republicans, who favor an Atlantic union and a more "realistic" attitude toward de Gaulle.

Rep. FINDLEY, who, as representative for Springfield was one of Mr. Pearson's hosts Saturday, is dedicating himself to arguing the need for an Atlantic community bound together with federal ties. Utopian as his goal may seem, he counts such major Republicans as Dwight Eisenhower and Barry Goldwater among his supporters, as well as the former NATO commander, Gen. Lauris Norstad.

GOP SUPPORT

Mr. FINDLEY finds too, that Republican support in Congress and at the grass-roots level, even in the supposedly isolationist Midwest, for his Atlantic dream is growing fast as the impasse with France escalates.

On Saturday Mr. Pearson paralleled the view of the Findleyite Republicans when he called on Washington to take the lead in establishing a closer Atlantic alliance, less dominated by U.S. authority. Perhaps this is the reason for the strange official silence

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

of the Johnson administration to Mr. Pearson's provocative remarks.

The president may not have been informed of the import of Mr. Pearson's speech. But there are others in the administration who fear that to answer the prime minister would give the Republicans ammunition to suggest that Mr. Johnson's leadership of the West has become so poor that even America's closest friends, the Canadians, are complaining.

[From the New York Times, June 12, 1966]

NATO SUBSTITUTE URGED BY PEARSON—SAYS UNITED STATES SHOULD SHOW WAY TO REVITALIZED ALLIANCE

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., June 11.—Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada urged here tonight that the United States lead the way in establishing a new, revitalized Atlantic alliance to replace what he described as the outdated North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Whether or not the organization survive the crisis precipitated by the French military withdrawal, he said the Atlantic powers must move forward to "an international community with common political institutions."

"An alliance for defense only is an anachronism in the world of 1966," the Prime Minister declared.

In an address purpose for an Atlantic Union dinner in the Leland Hotel, Mr. Pearson obliquely critized the United States for not acting sooner to alter "an Atlantic alliance of independent states, dominated by America."

"France, and not only France, feels that continental Europe is now strong enough to be given its rightful share in the control of the policies of the alliance" declared the Prime Minister, who won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1957.

Earlier in the day, Mr. Pearson received an Atlantic Union at a ceremony in New Salem State Park, where the village of New Salem has been restored as it was when Abraham Lincoln ran a store there. The award was presented by Clarence Strett, president of Federal Union, Inc. This is a private organization that has worked for many years to bring European and North American states together in federation. Christion Herter, former Secretary of State, also was given an Atlantic Union peace award. The late Adlai E. Stevenson, who was the chief United States delegate to the United Nations, also was honored with a peace award.

CITES DOUBT AND DISTRUST

Prime Minister Pearson said that the Atlantic powers had worked together enthusiastically in the trying days after World War II but had developed "impatience and doubt and some distrust" after the recovery of Europe. NATO, he suggested, had fallen victim to "intertia and vested interest in a new status quo."

He said Canada, since 1964, had tried without success "to find anyone . . . on either side of the Atlantic . . . prepared to specify what should be changed (in NATO)."

Change at last was occurring only because "abrupt and unilateral action by France thrust change upon us," he said.

Mr. Pearson disagreed with the nationalist motives of President de Gaulle in taking France out of the defense alliance. But he suggested it was "dangerous" to rail at General de Gaulle for demanding for France "a position in the Atlantic alliance equal to that of Great Britain and somewhat closer to that of the United States." Rather, Mr. Pearson said, the Atlantic power must find a way to enable France to participate "in the march to greater not less Atlantic unity."

The way, he suggested, would be to build toward Atlantic unity by first giving Europe "more control . . . of its direction and its character."

"I realize," he said, "that the united Europe would, in its political, economic and military decisions, be more independent of Washington than is the case now.

"But what is wrong with this?" he asked.

A realistic approach to Atlantic union, he said, would be to accept a united Europe, Britain, "not as an obstacle to, but as a stage on the way to Atlantic union.

"If we cannot at present achieve a pattern of Atlantic federalism," he said, "it may be necessary to acknowledge the realities of the situation and, as North Americans, work with Europeans in the hope that, in the longer sweep of history, both European and North America will come to realize that their respective affairs can best be harmonized in a wider union.

"If an intervening European stage is necessary, however, it must be taken not in continental isolation but in close Atlantic cooperation and understanding.

He added that he felt that "continentalism, either of the European or North American variety is not the answer."

Finally I believe "only the United States can give the effective lead required for Atlantic unity," he said. Without her active participation and support nothing can be done, at least on the broad front which is essential. Without her leadership we will be driven back to a national or continental solution for the organization of security and for progress."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, May 30, 1966]

PANEL URGES COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES—STATE DEPARTMENT HELD SLOW TO FACE NEED FOR LARGER UNITY

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

WASHINGTON, May 29.—North American and European countries were urged today to give up part of their national sovereignty in building an Atlantic community that eventually could grow into a worldwide "community of democracies."

The National Planning Association said Americans—and the State Department—have been too slow in facing up to the positive requirements needed in the construction of a more secure order.

This group of influential leaders in business, labor, agriculture and the professions contended that the Atlantic nations must be prepared to create a common organization that could integrate their foreign and defense policies.

NO VETO POWER

Following a pattern established by the six-nation European Common Market, decisions could be made on the basis of a "weighted vote" that, in effect, would deny the United States the veto power it now holds in the United Nations and NATO.

At the outset, the proposed Atlantic Community Organization would have the powers necessary to raise appropriations to carry out foreign and defense policies.

Economic integration and the knotty problem of freedom of migration, would come later, under the National Planning Association formula.

In addition, the Atlantic community would not be an exclusive "club." As conditions permit and agreement is reached, democracies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America would be added.

FEDERAL PATTERN

The association said the proposed international organization should be based upon the Federal pattern followed when the thirteen American colonies formed the United States.

Certain powers now exercised by the individual nation-states would be delegated to the "community," an agency with supranational powers.

In a report entitled "Strengthening the Free World through Steps toward Atlantic Unification," the N.P.A. board and its standing committees argued that the "limitations" of the nation-state are obvious in a world threatened by nuclear weapons.

MORE EVOLUTION NEEDED

The United Nations and NATO were expressions of a growing trend toward "interdependence" and "community," it said, but more "evolution" is needed.

"Along with the feeling of loyalty Americans have always had toward their city or town, their state and their country, they will have to develop an additional loyalty toward a larger political entity," said the report.

"For the people of the United States, however, the price will not be paid in the loss of their sovereignty. In a democracy, sovereignty is the possession of its citizens: the governments they create are only their agents. . . .

"The sovereign citizens of a democracy can entrust certain functions to entities other than national governments without 'sacrificing' or 'losing' any of the sovereignty they possess.

"They lose nothing, and may gain much, by delegating powers to a new agent when the existing agency cannot adequately serve their interests in peace, freedom and economic welfare."

The National Planning Association said an integrated Atlantic community could be created "around" France if President Charles de Gaulle continues his nationalistic policies.

Once Europe and North America are united, it said, there will be a sufficient concentration of military power to secure peace and a sufficient concentration of economic strength to bring real improvements in the living standards of less developed nations.

At a press conference last week in which today's report was discussed in advance of publication, top officials of the N.P.A. expressed disappointment over the State Department's attitude toward Atlantic community.

Elmo Roper, the public opinion expert and a member of the association's board, summarized the department's attitude as: "It's a fine idea, but not now."

Roper noted that Senate support for the concept is rising.

In 1946, only the last Estes Kefauver favored the community idea. Now, he said, Senators GORE (D., Tenn.), CASE (R., N.J.), COOPER (R., Ky.), MCGEE (D., Wyo.), CHURCH (D., Idaho), KUCHEL (R., Cal.), JAVITS (R., N.Y.), MCCARTHY (D., Minn.) and others support bills pending before Congress.

Airline Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, "Public patience is wearing thin," so ends the following editorial from the Bristol, Tenn., Herald-Courier, which speaks out on the present airline strike.

Everyone's patience is being stretched to its limits by this disregard for the public welfare. I do not wish to see the Federal Government take control of the airlines, but I do urge that lawful means be used to end this strike, and, if necessary, that stricter laws be enacted to prevent this from happening again.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5

In Chicago, the National Guard continued to patrol the Negro district which saw three days of rioting last week. However, the guard force was reduced yesterday when 1,236 of the 4,200 troops were sent home.

Maj. Gen. Francis P. Kane said disturbances had dwindled since the guardsmen began patrolling the west side area Friday.

At a news conference in Montreat, N.C., evangelist Bill Graham said the Chicago riots were organized by extremists teaching violence. He said President Johnson and the FBI know who they are and should name them.

At South Bend, Ind., police were trying to ascertain the cause of rioting Sunday night in a predominately Negro area. Seven persons were injured, none seriously, by stones, bricks and bottles and the teeth of police dogs.

The Cleveland rioting, in the predominantly-Negro Hough East Side area, lasted more than six hours.

Then, just before daybreak, firemen fought a blaze which roared through a supermarket at Hough Avenue and Crawford Road and spread to an adjacent apartment building. Police at first said there was a possibility that some people were trapped in an apartment, but said later that all occupants apparently got out safely. Firemen had reported hearing screams as flames enveloped the building.

It was the fourth sizable fire in a four-block area near that intersection.

Police and newsmen reported they were shot at by snipers in the Hough area last night as police sought to quiet the widely scattered disturbances.

Police shot out street lights in the vicinity of East 75th and Hough to keep from being targets and ordered all occupants out of an apartment building there in a vain effort to find a sniper.

Firemen trying to fight fires—some started by fire bombs—were shot at and had to dodge bottles, fire bombs and rocks, police reported.

A gang of men cut a fire hose near 86th Street, where half a block of two-story brick and frame store buildings burned.

Firemen were called off twice because of interference but returned to put out the flames. They were aided by a brief, early morning rain. The rain also helped police clear the streets.

A witness said Mrs. Arnett—who was killed by gunfire—had been ordered into a building as police sought to clear the 73rd street intersection; she was shot as she leaned out a second-floor window and screamed for her three children.

There had been sporadic gunfire in the area at the time, and no one was able to say where the bullet came from that killed the woman, police said.

Wallace Kelly, 32, and Alton Burks, 18, both residents of the area, were shot, but aides at Mount Sinai Hospital said the wounds were not serious. Circumstances of the shootings were not known.

A team of Associated Press and Cleveland Plain Dealer newsmen and photographers was fired on twice by a sniper after they passed a police roadblock to get to the Hough-75th intersection.

CHANGE OF PLANS TO TRIAL OF U.S. PILOTS BY NORTH VIETNAM

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, by reports yesterday we learned that North Vietnam has informally notified this country that at the present time it has no plans to try captured U.S. pilots as war criminals. Undoubtedly this change of plans on the part of North Vietnam can be traced to tremendous world pressure and the demand of public opinion that North Vietnam abide by the Geneva Convention of 1949.

The convention agreement was signed by 61 governments including the United States and the Soviet Union, but not Communist China. However, on earlier occasions both South Vietnam and North Vietnam have indicated a willingness to abide by the convention, but Hanoi had previously indicated it would try the Americans as war criminals notwithstanding.

Following this report from Hanoi, however, the world was shocked by the news that North Vietnamese troops executed at least six wounded U.S. Marines whose company had been ambushed. The Washington Post reported this morning:

> Eyewitnesses said the Communists moved methodically through the ranks of the wounded, shooting in the head anyone who moved.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous, barbaric, insensible, act committed against our troops. By this action North Vietnam further isolates itself from the civilized nations of the world.

We should not be misled by Hanoi's latest informal assurances. The senseless slaughter of wounded soldiers is an even more shocking violation of the Geneva Convention that would be a trial of the pilots. The Agreement on Condition of Soldiers Wounded in Armies in the Field was signed at Geneva in 1864 and was revised in 1906 and 1929. This convention provides for protection and treatment of sick and wounded who fall into enemy hands.

The 1949 convention as well as these earlier conventions protected these soldiers. Article 12 of the 1949 agreement reads:

> Irrespective of the individual responsibilities that may exist, the Detaining Power is responsible for the treatment given them (prisoners of war).

Mr. Speaker, this language is clear and unequivocal. It means, notwithstanding the fact that North Vietnam is not a signatory, international law recognizes the Central Government in Hanoi as responsible for the field commander's orders that the U.S. marines who were wounded be executed. Article 13 requires that all prisoners of war must be humanely treated. The article reads:

> Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner is prohibited.

These wounded marines were for all intents and purposes prisoners of war when executed.

Hanoi should remember that it is an accepted principle of international law that where one belligerent has committed illegal acts of warfare against another belligerent, this second party may for the purpose of enforcing future compliance with the recognized rules of civilized warfare, employ reprisals. These are not adopted merely for revenge, but only as an unavoidable last resort to induce the enemy to desist from illegitimate practices. The use of reprisals is an accepted part of U.S. policy and is outlined in the most basic Army field manuals.

Hanoi has invited swift and decisive reprisals against her for this type of action, and should know that this type of conduct on the part of the enemy only serves to unify our determination, not divide our resolve. This was a lesson that the Japanese Empire learned many times over following the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution relating to U.S. military personnel held captive in Vietnam and expresses the sense of Congress that North Vietnam seriously diminishes the opportunity for the achievement of a just and secure peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia by such actions. I believe its speedy passage would help to convince the Communists they must abide by established rules of international law or face reprisals.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

(Mr. MARTIN of Alabama (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this is a tragic day in American history. The Congress of the United States is being coerced into debating and passing legislation under threat that if we fail to do so the mobs will take over in the streets of this Nation. This is not democracy, Mr. Speaker, this is anarchy.

Who is the authority for demanding that we pass this legislation with a pistol, in the form of the threat of mob action, held at our heads? I regret to remind you that it is the leadership of the majority party. Yesterday, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee said that if we do not pass this bill, or if we voted against the resolution to bypass the orderly procedures of Congress that we would be encouraging the mobs. Of course, he put its nicely by saying we would be encouraging the militant voices. Further on in yesterday's debate, the majority leader on the other side of the aisle said that we must pass this civil rights bill soon if it is to be passed at all in this session of Congress.

Why must we pass it now? Why could not we follow the orderely procedures and allow this bill to come to the floor from the Rules Committee, after proper hearings? Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the leadership on the other side knows that the American people are fed up with mob rule and government by demonstration, directed by hoodlums. I think the leadership on the other side knows that if the people of this country find out what this bill will actually do, how much of their freedoms will be taken away, they will rise up in rightous anger to demand its defeat.

Mr. Speaker, as for me, I would rather trust the American people than the mobs in the streets. I speak for law-abiding citizens, the overwhelming majority of hard working, honest, dedicated Amer-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090004-5